

1890.

is stri-
Ledger,
by the
a deter-
for it,
Reput-
islands,
Amer-
in Fic-
o select
ants as
g their
amples
Frederic
ks of a
eatten-
" and
l takes
or some
ook.
which
uccess,
varying
Daniel

way of
amenda
ber it-
of the
on the
eleven
nted in
Dudley
udent,
luences
number-
by the
A Pre-
Lon-
s. His
d Eng-
Pierre
which
aphrey
on. It
strated
d Ken-
ons by
Nelson
"Mr.
with an
dialect
oman,"
have
scours-
ymment
ligious

able of
(fron-
rated),
Edgar
ed, by
d), by
art II.
poem),
e" (il-
Four-
"Lit-
manim-
Place."
areth,"
of the
John-
ew of
s," by

ble of
ank R.
am P.
"The
biting;
Depart-
XII.,
that in
the En-
rain to
Kirk;
United
arriage
t," by
necient
"Mr.
Books

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3.

JANUARY, 1891.

No. 4.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

SOCIALISM AND THE BIBLE.

BY REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., LL.D., COLUMBUS, O.

I HAVE been invited to discuss the teachings of the Bible with respect to Socialism. The question is indefinite. What part of the Bible—Genesis or John, the Levitical Code, or the Sermon on the Mount? The specific treatment of social questions or of moral questions is not uniform in all parts of the Bible. Actions and institutions which are commanded or allowed in one book are condemned in another. The Bible represents many centuries of moral progress: it is not to be supposed that the moral rule of the earlier stages of this progress will be identical with that of the later stages.

Nor can it be safely assumed that the *specific* teachings of the Bible, as a whole, with respect to specific acts and institutions, are binding upon the people of this generation. The last word of the Bible was written eighteen hundred years ago; since that time the world has greatly changed, largely through the influence of the Bible itself; and the maxims and usages which were current then are now obsolete. Since the last of the apostles laid down his pen an enormous progress has taken place, and the moral standards of to-day are far higher than they were when Paul was writing, under the shadow of the Colosseum, his last letter to Timothy. Now the writers of the New Testament, as well as of the Old, assume the existence of certain social institutions, and do not make open war upon them. They are not political reformers, they are the heralds and witnesses of a new spiritual dispensation. Slavery and polygamy both prevailed in Bible times, and they are assumed as existing by all the Bible writers who refer to them. There is no explicit condemnation of them. It was argued, very plausibly, by good men of the last generation that the Bible sanctions slavery—that it is a divine institution, as truly so as the family. Those who take the

Bible for a book of oracles, and assume that one text is just as authoritative as another, can hardly come to any other conclusion. But those who take the Bible as a record of the progress of a people under divine guidance, and thus as a revelation of the divine will, may find some other interpretation of its reticence respecting evils of this nature. It assumes existing institutions, and shows us how they are silently modified and transformed by the working of divine principles and motives implanted in the hearts of men. These motives and principles were at work in the world from the days of Abraham to the days of John the Baptist, bringing about great social changes during that period; they have been at work no less vigorously from the days of Peter and Paul to the days of Newman and Moody, and the changes which they have wrought in these later generations are mightier far than those of the earlier period. The writers of the Bible assumed slavery and polygamy, but the principles which they taught undermined slavery and polygamy, and they have disappeared from Christendom.

The fact that we find an institution or a practice existing in Bible times, and unrebuked by Bible writers, is not, then, any warrant for its existence to-day. Perhaps, the Bible itself has wrought in human society such changes that this institution or practice has been outlawed. It might have been fit and suitable for the first century—the best thing for that time; but it does not follow that it is a good thing for the nineteenth century, any more than that the garments which were fit and suitable for you when you were one year old are fit and suitable for you when you are twenty.

If, therefore, we should find either Individualism or Socialism recognized and accepted by any of the Bible writers, that fact

would not guarantee its validity for the present day. It is only by a careful study of the motives and principles which appear to control that great moral movement of which the Bible is at once the record and the inspiration, that we can pronounce upon the question whether the Bible is on the side of Socialism. There is a stream of tendency which we may be able to trace—an increasing purpose which runs through the ages of the patriarchs and the prophets and down through the Christian centuries. Which way do we find that current setting—toward Individualism or Socialism?

The existence of private property is everywhere recognized in the Bible. We are told that private property in land is a modern institution; that the original form of ownership was communal rather than individual.

Be this as it may, the earliest of the Hebrew records indicate the private possession of land, nor do I know that there is any trace of an earlier communism. It is true that the patriarchs, whose lives form the theme of the first literature, were generally nomads; for purposes of cultivation and permanent residence they had little need of land; it was chiefly for burial plots that they seem to have desired a secure title. But, on their occupation of Canaan, the Israelites entered upon the agricultural stage of their history, and then the land was parcelled out among them—each tribe in a location by itself, and each family of the tribe in its own secure possession. From this time onward the principle of private property in land—with certain important limitations—was firmly established in Israel.

This does not appear to have been a lesson learned in Egypt. The tenure of land among the Egyptians was not that which the Israelites adopted at the time of the partition of Canaan. The land of Egypt was mainly held by the kings and by communities of priests, who let it out to the peasantry on terms that were none too liberal; in later times large portions of it were divided among the soldiers as a reward for military service, by a method somewhat similar to that feudal system under which Europe was parcelled out during the middle ages. It could not have been from Egypt, therefore, that the Israelites derived their land system. It was far more popular and democratic than any model which they had ever seen. Some of the tribes were permitted to win for themselves, by conquest, rich portions of the soil still held by the original tribes, and to divide these among themselves; but most of them received their inheritance by lot from the hand of Joshua.

The impression is given in the narrative that every family of the nation received a freehold as its own peculiar possession.

From this time forward, for several generations, agriculture was, no doubt, the principal employment of the Israelites; the laws contained in Ex. xxi.-xxiii.; which all the critics regard as the oldest portion of the Levitical legislation, rest upon the assumption that the people are all agriculturists. And not only does this ancient legislation recognize the land itself as the property of those occupying it, it also refers to the fruits of the land and the domestic animals as private property, and thus recognizes the fact that production was not under any kind of collective management.

I have alluded, however, to an important limitation to the private ownership of land among the Israelites. You know that I refer to that remarkable statute providing for a year of Jubilee, in which all the land was to return to the family to which it was originally assigned. A Hebrew family might part with its patrimony; through sickness and misfortune it might incur debts, and be obliged to give up its land in payment; the thrifty and the extortionate might thus succeed in accumulating large estates—like some conscienceless money-lenders and land-grabbers of these times; but at the end of every fifty years the trumpets proclaiming the year of Jubilee compelled these landed proprietors to relinquish all the estates they had thus acquired, and sent every family back to its own homestead, putting it in full possession of the ancestral acres.

Precisely when this system was introduced we are not told, nor do we know how faithfully it was adhered to; from references in Jeremiah (xxxiv., 14) and Ezekiel (xlv., 16, 17) it would appear that such regulations were considered binding in the days of these prophets; it is not likely that they were observed after the Exile. But to every Jew who regarded the law as the very word of God, this solemn testimony of his statute with respect to the tenure of the land must have been a weighty word.

On economic principles it would be easy to find fault with such an arrangement; but it does not profess to be based on economic principles. It seems to recognize the fact that under the law of unrestricted competition the rich are likely to grow richer and the poor poorer; it is a legal barrier erected in the path of this increasing inequality. It says to encroaching wealth, "Thus far and no farther!" It lifts up the victims of misfortune and pov-

erty and sets them on their feet, and gives them another chance. In the eloquent words of Dr. Munger :

"One might add field to field for a series of years, but after a time the process ceased, and the lands went back to their original owners. The purpose was to make such a habit unprofitable, to keep the resources of society evenly distributed, to prevent the rich from becoming too rich and the poor hopelessly poor, to undo misfortune, to give those who had erred through sloth or improvidence an opportunity to improve the lessons of poverty, to prevent children from reaping the faults of their parents; one generation might squander its portion, but the next was not forced to inherit the consequences. Thus, once in fifty years society was rehabilitated. It was a perpetual lesson in hope and encouragement. It took off accumulated burdens. It put limits about the cruelty of man to man. It was a constant assertion of equality. It fostered patriotism, a virtue that thrives best on the soil. It kept alive in every man a sense of ownership of his country."^{*}

Other features of this legislation revealed the same spirit. Every seventh year every Hebrew slave was freed. Slavery was not forbidden, but no Hebrew could be a slave more than seven years at a time. Every seventh year was a Sabbatical year, wherein also all debts were remitted, no matter when incurred. The debtor class ceased to exist every seven years. The law interposed and released every man from his financial obligations. Probably there was not much borrowing or trusting under such laws. The creditor class was distinctly warned that its power over the debtor class would be broken on the first day of the Sabbatical year. Every man who made a loan made it with this consequence in full view. The extended credits which are so costly and often so fatal to character were impossible under such a system.

The general drift of this legislation is obvious. Certainly it does not conform to the philosophy of Individualism. It is the antithesis of *Laissez faire*. The notion that the only function of government is the police-function—that it discharges its whole duty when it keeps order in society and suffers the strong and the weak to struggle with each other for the possession of the wealth of the land, careless who secures it—is not the notion on which this legislation is based. It is paternal legislation, indeed, of a very stringent sort. It assumes that

some are weaker than others, and that one of the functions of the State is to keep the strong from oppressing the weak. As Dr. Munger says, "It was a continual rebuke to the hardness of avarice; it assured the poor and unfortunate that by a divine law his burden would be taken off."

And yet this system is not properly described as Socialism. It recognizes not only private property, but private enterprise; it leaves plenty of room for individual initiative; it allows men to suffer, though not hopelessly, the consequences of their own idleness and improvidence; it keeps the responsibilities of life resting pretty heavily on the shoulders of the individual. Perhaps we may say that this legislation is a manifest attempt to secure the advantages of private ownership and private enterprise and at the same time to guard against their abuses. The point to be noted is, however, that it regards such abuses as inseparable from private ownership and private enterprise; and that it enlists the power of the State for their correction. In this respect it may be said to be socialistic. It does not regard natural law as adequate for the equitable solution of social questions, but assumes that the State must interpose for the removal of the inequalities and the redress of the injuries which are seen to result from the unrestricted competition of the weak with the strong.

After some generations of this quiet agricultural life, the people of Israel, like the people of the United States, advanced to a commercial period. The Canaanites had been the traders; but Israel began to tread, cautiously at first, in the path which her people have since followed so diligently. "The towns," says Wellhausen, "grew more influential than the country; money notably increased, and the zeal of piety was quite unable to arrest the progress of the change which set in. . . . The extortions of the corn market, the formation of large estates, the frequency of mortgages—all show that the small peasant proprietorship was unable to hold its own against the accumulations of wealth. The wage-receiving class increased, and cases in which free Hebrews sold themselves into slavery were not rare."^{*} This would indicate that the Jubilee legislation had become a dead letter. But the prophets, who at this later day represent the divine government, never cease to protest against these inequalities and oppressions.

"Woe unto them," cries Isaiah, "that

^{*} "The Freedom of Faith," p. 184.

^{*} Encyclopedia Britannica, XIII., 408.

join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land. In mine ears saith the Lord of hosts, of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant."

"Woe unto him," saith Jeremiah, "that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by injustice; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not his hire; that saith, I will build me a wide house and spacious chambers, and cutteth him out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion. Shalt thou reign, because thou strivest to excel in cedar? did not thy father eat and drink, and do judgment and justice? Then it was well. Was not this to know me? saith the Lord. But thine eyes and thine heart are not but for thy covetousness, and for to shed innocent blood, and for oppression, and for violence, to do it."

"Woe unto them," thunders Micah, "that devise iniquity and work evil upon their beds! when the morning is light, they practise it, because it is in the power of their hands. And they covet fields, and seize them; and houses, and take them away; and they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage."

Such was the clear and constant witness of the prophets against the "mercantilism" of their day—the heartless greed unchecked by law which, in the words of Habakkuk, built towns with blood and established cities by iniquity. For doubtless all the practices which drew from heaven these thunderous "woes" were perfectly legal, and in strict accordance with the doctrines of individualistic economy. These men had gotten possession of the fields and the houses of their neighbors by obedience to the natural laws of trade; by buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest; by mortgages and bills of sale executed in regular form. The natural laws of trade were having free course and being glorified after their own fashion. This was the burden of the prophet's denunciation. Once there was a divine law which interposed for the prevention of such oppression; that law has lost its force, but the prophet, who speaks the divine message, lifts up his voice to rebuke the iniquity and to threaten the land with overthrow if it be not repented of and forsaken. The humane spirit of the earlier legislation finds constant expression in the preaching of the prophets.

We may safely say, then, that while the Old Testament nowhere inculcates the socialistic theories, its legislation and its teach-

ing manifest certain socialistic tendencies. Rodbertus and Bellamy would find their fundamental ideas set at naught in these laws and prophecies, but they could derive, I think, rather more comfort from them, after all, than Ricardo or Malthus could ever have done.

But Israel, enervated by luxury and weakened by ill gotten wealth, at length fell a prey to the stronger nations round about; its people were scattered, its national power was broken. Then, in the midst of its deepest degradation, came forth that Prince and Saviour in whom its life was renewed, and by whom the promise of its triumph shall be fulfilled. Law and prophecy and ritual find their realization in the Christ of Nazareth, to whom alone these great words of Isaiah can be applied, "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth even forever."

What now saith this Lawgiver concerning the powers and duties of government? Was Jesus, the Christ, a Socialist? Is Christianity Socialism?

Count Leo Tolstoi says that He was an Anarchist—of that peaceful and non-resistant type to which the erratic Russian nobleman himself belongs. He declares that the command of our Lord, "Resist not evil," forbids the support of all governments maintained by force; forbids the arrest and imprisonment of evil-doers; forbids the collection of taxes by legal process; takes away, in fact, the very foundations of government as at present administered. Count Tolstoi teaches that if we were consistent Christians we should not only disband our armies, but dismiss our police, discharge our judges and sheriffs, and turn our court houses into art galleries and our jails into hospitals. Count Tolstoi labors with the Sermon on the Mount to show that this must be the precise meaning of our Lord, and succeeds, to his own satisfaction. It is not a difficult thing to do, if you adopt his method of interpretation, which is, it must be confessed, the orthodox method. If Christ's words are to be taken literally; if no allowance be made for metaphor and hyperbole, then this doctrine and a great many other ridiculous doctrines can be easily deduced from them. I do not suppose, however, that many intelligent persons are ready to accept Count Tolstoi's interpretation of Christ's words. Jesus certainly told his disciples to support existing governments; and

the governments existing were maintained by force.

Jesus was not an Anarchist, even of Count Tolstoi's non-resistant type. Was he, then, a Socialist? If the one word described him, the other could not; for the Anarchist and the Socialist are political antipodes. The one would abolish government; the other would extend the range and power of government until it should cover nearly the whole of life. The Socialist desires that the government shall own and manage all the farms, all the mines, all the railroads, all the factories, all the stores and shops; that it shall own and lease all the dwelling-houses; that it shall employ and direct all the teachers, physicians, artists, musicians, journalists; that all the people shall belong to the civil service and do their work under the direction of government, receiving from the government their stipend, which they may exchange in the government warehouses for the goods there stored. This enormous extension of the functions of the government is what is meant by Socialism. It signifies the nationalization of land and capital and industry—of the machinery of production and transportation and distribution. Socialism would have the government the only capitalist, the only manufacturer, the only merchant, the only employer, the only landlord; the people would all be laborers, mechanics, clerks, overseers, employés of one grade or another in the service of the government.

Such being the nature of Socialism, it is, of course, absurd to say that Jesus Christ was in any proper sense of the word a Socialist. Whatever visions of the future he may have entertained, it would have been impossible for the people who lived at that day to conceive of such an organization of industry as that which Socialism now proposes. The economic conditions on which Socialism rests were not then existing—the division of labor, the machinery, the facilities of communication which render its programme conceivable, if not practicable, at the present day were then far in the future. Jesus Christ commanded his disciples to respect existing governments, but there is no word of his which hints at any such extension of the functions of government as the Socialists now demand.

That he was a Communist could be more plausibly maintained. Communism is the organization of the local community with common property for co-operative purposes. We have several communes now in full operation in this country; the whole nation might thus resolve itself into communistic

groups with very little change in our laws. The Shakers and the Zoarites are Communists, and it might be argued that some such fraternal organization as theirs would be in accordance with the precepts of Christ and with the spirit of his teachings. It is also true that the first Christian church at Jerusalem adopted, to some extent, communistic methods. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all as every man had need." Precisely to what extent this principle of the community of goods was carried it is difficult to say. It is possible that the words just quoted signify only that while they dwelt together in a common household, the transfer of property to the community was voluntary and only partial; that those who wished to do so retained in their own possession portions of their property; that it was only as the need arose that they disposed of houses and lands and brought the proceeds to augment the charity fund in the hands of the apostles. Such seems to be the implication of Peter's words to Ananias (Acts v. 4).

Even, however, if it be admitted that the Church at Jerusalem made the experiment of Communism, these facts must be borne in mind:

1. There is no recorded word of the Lord himself requiring or suggesting this manner of life.

2. This experiment was, on the economic side, a palpable failure. The Church at Jerusalem was reduced to the depths of poverty, and contributions had to be taken by Paul and his associates in Europe for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem.

3. We have no record of any other attempts to organize churches upon a communistic basis. Many other churches were formed by the apostles in Asia and in Europe; but the members of these churches continued to live in separate households, to hold private property, and to carry on business in the old way. There are frequent references in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles to the social life of the early Christians, and there is no indication that they regarded the manner of life of the Church at Jerusalem as a model for them.

What we are entitled to say about the commune at Jerusalem is only this: that the spirit which found expression in it was the very spirit of Christ, but that the method was not adapted to that day and age, and was, therefore, a failure. The spirit has never departed from the Christian church; the method has been sometimes employed,

as in the monastic communities, but has not yet commended itself to the enlightened judgment of Christians as the best method for the organization of social life. All attempts at co-operative industry or co-operative housekeeping are, however, approximations to this communistic plan, and the time may come when it will be adopted far more widely than it is to-day. So M. Renan prophesies:

"When modern individualism has borne its last fruits; when humanity, dwarfed, dismal, impuissant, shall return to great institutions and their strong discipline; when our shop-keeping society, say, rather, when our world of pygmies shall have been driven out with scourges by the heroic and idealistic portion of humanity, then life in common will be prized again as much as ever. A number of great things, such as science, will organize themselves in a monastic form. . . . The splendid ideal traced by the author of the Acts shall be inscribed as a prophetic revelation over the entrance of the paradise of humanity, 'All that believed were together and had all things common.'"^{*}

That Christianity is developing the co-operative man, and is thus preparing the way for such voluntary co-operation as M. Renan predicts, may be hopefully asserted. But this is a very different thing from that complete subjection of the individual to the State which is the essence of Socialism.

Nevertheless, we often hear it said that Christ was the first Socialist; that Christianity is essential Socialism. "Every Christian," says Émile de Lavaleye, "who understands and earnestly accepts the teaching of his Master is at heart a Socialist, and every Socialist, whatever may be his hatred against all religion, bears within himself an unconscious Christianity. . . . It is impossible to understand by what strange blindness Socialists adopt Darwinian theories, which condemn their claims of equality, while at the same time they reject Christianity, whence these claims have issued, and where their justification may be found. At all events, we may conclude that the religion which has shaped us all, advocates as well as adversaries, has formulated in the clearest terms the principles of Socialism, and that it is precisely in Christian countries that socialistic doctrines have taken deepest root."[†]

These words lack precision, but they convey a partial truth. To say that Chris-

tianity "has formulated in the clearest terms the principles of Socialism" is wide of the mark, but it is true that Christianity embodies the spirit and purpose which Socialism seeks to realize. Let us note the particulars in which the Christianity of the New Testament and the Socialism of to-day are in substantial accord:

1. They are agreed in the desire to befriend the poor, to relieve the oppressed, to protect the weak against the craft of the strong. They unite in repudiating that heartless philosophy which has prevailed so long, whose maxim is, "Every man for himself." Instead of giving liberty to the strong, that they may oppress the weak, they teach that it is the duty of the strong to help the weak. This is one of the first principles of Christianity, and it is, I believe, one of the leading motives of those who are advocating Socialism.

2. They unite in condemning the degree of inequality which now exists in society, and in wishing to bring about a more equitable distribution of the national wealth.

3. They agree in believing that the existing oppressions and inequalities can be greatly lessened and mitigated by the application to them of intelligence and conscience. They do not regard them as the result of inexorable law, but as evils removable by wise human effort.

4. They go together for a little way in their demand that the State interpose for the removal of such inequalities, but it is here that they part company, modern Socialism pushing this demand much further than Christianity is yet inclined to do.

"Christianity," says Lavaleye, "condemns riches and inequality with all the vehemence of Socialism; but it is not to the State that it looks for the establishment of the reign of justice." Not to the State alone, certainly; but why not to the State in part? Christianity inspires men with the spirit of co-operation; it teaches them how to co-operate; is there any reason why they should not co-operate, through political organization, for the restraint of extortion, for the promotion of equity? That is certainly a very large part of their high calling as the disciples of Christ. More than this, there are certain industries which are almost necessarily monopolies. It is through these, when they are in the hands of private persons, that many of the heaviest burdens are imposed upon the weak. It is in the power of those who hold these monopolies to tax the rest of the community for their own enrichment. Many great fortunes have been accumulated in this way. Now the

^{*} Quoted by J. Llewellyn Davies, in "Social Questions," p. 216.

[†] "The Socialism of To-Day," p. xix.

Christian law requires those who hold the power of the State (in a republic the people) to restrain and prevent such abuses. The sovereign power must not, by law, authorize some of the people to enrich themselves at the expense of the rest. The sovereign power must not stand idly by and see such wrongs perpetrated; it must take hold of them and right them. And there are also various methods in which the sovereign people, thus co-operating in political organizations, can promote the common welfare.

This is the principle of Socialism. We all go part way with the Socialists. We all believe in the Post Office and the Public School; to this extent we are Socialists. Those of us who are Christians find in the new commandment of our Lord the foundation of such institutions; they are illustrations of the law which binds us to work together for the common good. Why do we not go to the full length of the Socialists in this path? Why do we hesitate to commit to the State the entire control of land and capital, the entire organization and direction of industry and trade? We do co-operate in some industries; why not in all? Is it because we find in either Testament any specific prohibition of Socialism? No; I find none. Is it, then, solely because we believe that such co-operation is not practicable, from an economic point of view? Doubtless we may have our doubts on this score; but they are not decisive. The main reason why, as Christians, we hesitate, is our fear that in such a regimen as Socialism proposes character would be weakened, if not destroyed. Socialism greatly reduces if it does not cancel responsibility. It guarantees to all men a livelihood, no matter how idle and thriftless they may be. It solves for every man the problem of life, and protects him against the consequences of his own recklessness and folly. I do not think that character can be developed in any such school as this; I should expect to see the type of manhood steadily dwindling under the Socialistic regime.

Another phase of the same fact is described when we say that Socialism must greatly limit freedom. The expounders of its philosophy always argue against this conclusion, but it cannot be evaded. With any kind of human nature which we are likely to see on this planet within the next millennium, no socialistic machinery could be worked at all without the most vigilant surveillance, the most rigid despotism. Very little liberty would be left to anybody; we should all be put into the mill together

and compelled to tread a narrow and monotonous round.

It is precisely here that I find the fatal defect of Socialism; and it is precisely here that its conflict with the religion of the Bible is most clearly seen.

The Bible asserts and defends the freedom of every man; it suffers no invasion of his personality; it clears wide spaces all about him, and cries aloud to tyrants, hierarchs, demagogues, "Stand aside! give this man room to work out his own salvation!"

It puts the responsibilities of living upon him also, and compels him to bear them. "Every man shall give account for himself unto God." "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." While it seeks to surround every man with all the aids of infinite grace, while it makes it certain that no man who will lay hold on the hopes and helps set before him will ever be lost, it summons him to choose every day, life or death, blessing or cursing, and commits his destiny to his own volition. This is the only school in which virtue can be developed, and virtue is the one concern of Christianity. It is here that Socialism breaks down. It cares for comfort more than for character; it proposes to sacrifice in the attainment of comfort the conditions under which character is gained. In this it is directly in conflict with the deepest principles of Christianity.

Moreover, it is essentially materialistic in its methods. Its main reliance is upon an improved environment. It expects to reform men by reforming their circumstances. Christianity, on the other hand, puts its main reliance upon the spiritual forces by which men are changed, and looks to see the circumstances changed as the result of this inward renewal. Something can be done by both these methods; neither can be neglected; the only question is, which is the more radical; which shall be emphasized? Christianity puts the emphasis on the spiritual forces, and the answer of Christianity thus reveals a profounder philosophy and a deeper insight into the facts of life.

Nevertheless, we must not forget that it is with the method of Socialism, and not with its spirit or its purpose, that Christianity is at variance. The end which Socialism has in view is precisely the end at which Christianity has always been aiming. The wrongs which Socialism seeks to right are the wrongs against which the Hebrew prophets thundered, and Christ and his apostles lifted up their voices. And although the philosophy of Socialism is de-

fective, in its failure to cherish the values of character, it is nearer to Christianity, even in its extremest forms, than the soulless Individualism which has given the law to our political and economic science for the last hundred years. The great forerunners of our modern Socialism—Thomas More, the Italian Campanella, Francis Bacon—were they not all Christians, and did they not derive the very impulse to their work from Christ and his Gospel? To the great motive that moved them, wherever we find it active in human hearts, let us never fail to do full justice. And let us trust that, as we ponder those great themes, studying with open mind and sympathetic heart the problems of poverty, we may find the safe path through freedom and virtue into the thousand years of peace.

THE TRIALS OF YOUTH.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, October 23, 1890.

"It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth." To bear the yoke is to be in subjection: to be compelled to walk in certain lines at the will of another, to be prevented from choosing for ourselves and being our own masters. The compulsion which is most commonly felt in youth is the compulsion of circumstances. Without being in absolute poverty, the majority of young men find that they have no choice, but must at once try to earn a livelihood. And the limitations thus prescribed by circumstances are often very serious, and press very heavily on the mind of the aspiring youth; he is compelled to take what offers in the way of work, and to forego such occupations as he might have preferred; his education must be curtailed, however much he may long for the training a University curriculum gives; he has in many cases to postpone marriage, and finds that the neediness of relatives makes it impossible for him to lay up even the small sum which might eventually enable him somewhat to spread his wings. In fact, many young men find themselves born into most unfavorable circumstances so far as their prospects in life go, and they can see nothing before them but years of unremitting and uncongenial toil.

Still, if there is a spark of real manhood, a leaven of generosity in the spirit, it will be found good to bear this yoke. To throw

a boy into the water is a rough-and-ready lesson in the art of swimming, but with a boy of spirit it is likely to be successful. The training which straitened circumstances give is one which no money can purchase. It is true enough that many rich men's sons do well and work as hard as if they were entirely dependent on their own exertions. There are natures which do not need the spur of poverty, but have in themselves eagerness and incentive enough. It is also true that the advantages of education which wealth affords are not to be despised. But advantages of a different, if not of a superior kind, are present in circumstances where restriction and compulsion are always felt. A lad is put upon his mettle, and if there is grit in him at all, it will appear. He is conscious that it depends entirely on himself whether he is to succeed or to fail. He feels himself face to face with the world, and is compelled to use all his faculties and powers to save himself from defeat. The habits of industry, the love of work, the delight in mastering difficulties, the ability to put pressure on himself, and the independence of character which a lad thus acquires, pass into his nature as its permanent and most valuable ingredients. His income may be smaller than that of many of his contemporaries, but the man is ultimately of much more account than the income, and no circumstances have produced better men than those in which there was considerable hardship at first.

It must also be considered that the privations which press so heavily on some families, and which in some unhappy instances benumb affection, do in the main afford opportunities for self-sacrifice and consideration and concern for the common good which bind families together, and give a richness and beauty to the family life which you might have sought in vain had circumstances been easy and calling for no sacrifice.

Do not, then, quarrel with your circumstances. You may quite legitimately wish to change them, but hold firmly to the belief that there is no condition in life in which you may not fulfil God's will and do what needs to be done. Impatience, self-will, self-confidence, the pride of life, thirst for pleasure, romantic ideas, vanity, all that appears in youth as the froth of its life and energy, is better removed by the chastening, sobering, chilling touch of privation than by a thousand sermons.

But in other senses it is good that a man bear the yoke in his youth. He must put himself under control and discipline if he is

to get the full benefit of his youth. All this control and discipline is intended to fit him for liberty afterward, as all drill and gymnastics are meant to give the body freedom of movement, and to give a man the perfect use of all his powers. And all the while a boy is at school and under parental or other control, his natural instinct craves for the time when he shall be his own master. "His own master"—note the expression, for much of the secret of happiness and of liberty lies in it. The rock on which thousands of young lives are wrecked is a false and impracticable idea of liberty. To be free from control, to be our own master, that is the craving that haunts every one at the entrance of life. How is it to be achieved? Certainly not by flying in the face of the profoundest moral laws; every law you break becomes your tyrant, to arrest and punish you. There is no outlook through sin; that way freedom does not lie, but bondage. You cannot alter the laws of your own moral constitution, nor can you alter the laws of the world in which you are; you can never become your own master by endeavoring to live as if these laws were not. These laws are, and rule every human life, and to run counter to them is to make it a certainty that you shall never be a freeman.

We must then learn to correct the natural but erroneous impression we have, that doing whatever the lower parts of our nature prompt us to do is to have liberty and to be our own master. To allow passions, cravings, propensities, to rule us and govern and determine our conduct is to become the worst of slaves. External authority or tyranny a man may resist or escape from, but when his own passions are his tyrant he becomes the most abject and hopeless of slaves. You see it in a thousand instances. The lad who but a year ago allowed himself to be led by his lower nature, and made experiment of some form of profligacy under the impression he was asserting his liberty and commencing to do as he pleased, has already found that he has become a slave to the passions he has indulged, and that they compel him to do their bidding, though he knows he is ruining his prospects in life, risking his health, sacrificing his character, distressing his best friends. There is absolutely no path to liberty through wrongdoing. The road is barred that way. We are merely duped by our passions if we suppose that we are our own masters when we yield ourselves to do the bidding of our lusts.

Freedom comes through discipline; through absorbing into our own will the

laws which govern our life; to be our own master is to exercise self-control, and allow that in us to rule which was intended to be supreme. When we submit ourselves to the rule of conscience and come into harmony with God's laws, approving them in our heart, then only are we free. We have then nothing against us, nothing outwardly constraining us—our own will moves us in the same direction as God's law and will. You are not your own master while you obey the lowest things in you; you are your own master when you can make yourself do what you judge to be right—when that which you call yourself and which is the core of your being rules all the rest that is in you. You yourself are something nobler and better than any of your members or any faculty in you; these are your organs and instruments whereby you work on the world around you, but you yourself are different from these, and are called to rule all these. Thus only is it possible to become your own master.

To carry this out in detail may be said to constitute the whole training and trial of youth. He who emerges into manhood with self-control, approving heartily and choosing with his whole soul what is right, and able to make his lower nature do his bidding, may be said to have overcome. He who enters manhood a slave to any evil habit, with no strong self-control, weak, flabby, unreliable, a dead weight that adds to the world's bias to ruin—he may be said to have missed the main use of his early years. Like all blessings, our youth looks largest when we have lost it. While we have it we think it the time for disporting ourselves before we settle to the earnest and work of life; when we look back on it we see it was the only time we have for giving a tone to all that follows.

Coming to detail, then, we must exercise self-control in respect of all unworthy pleasures. The youth of a certain kind and brought up in certain companies thinks he is scarcely a man till he has tasted pleasures which he knows to be forbidden. The very fact that they are forbidden makes them objects of desire. He cannot reconcile himself to the thought that others are enjoying what he has not tasted; that they have experiences he has not. There can be no question that to most dispositions "stolen waters are sweet." In wild lawlessness there is a charm which pleasantly contrasts with the monotony of business and the humdrum of daily life. New powers and capacities are called out. The paths of dissipation are new ground, and invite with

all the charm of novelty. There are chances of adventure, of seeing new phases of life, inducements of various kinds which in point of fact do prevail with a very large proportion of young men. And these inducements present themselves not once or twice, but continually; and if in one mood they have little power with us, in another they may prevail.

The true corrective of this bias toward unworthy pleasures is to be found in filling our life with worthy pursuits. Of course knowledge also helps. When one has seen a little more of life, the pleasures which attract the mass of young men seem so very childish, so false, and tawdry, so positively repulsive in many respects, that one wonders where the charm is. The company in which paint and padding count for beauty, and coarseness or profanity for wit, is not the company any man of discernment or cultivated mind could find himself comfortable in. The degradation on the part of the performers to which many popular entertainments lead, would touch any manly heart and make it painful to be a party to such degradation. In the cloak-room of many a place of entertainment you must with your coat leave your self-respect and all respect for humanity, and necessarily come out a poorer man, with less fitness for life.

But even when the pleasures that attract are recognized to be such as no men of any real stature and dignity could possibly stoop to, our self-control needs some other aid than that of knowledge. It is good to say to ourselves, these scenes I am asked to join are degrading and delusive. Instead of proving my manhood by entering them, I show distinctly that my manhood is poor and weak, easily deceived, easily led, ignorant and undeveloped. It is good to cherish and strengthen our self-control thus, and by reading such healthy writers as Thackeray, whose scorn of all that is base and foolish and filthy and profane communicates itself to the reader and makes that seem contemptible which is contemptible, and that be repulsive to us which in itself is repulsive.

But the true safeguard is to fill the heart and life with higher things, to commit ourselves cordially to the Christian life, recognizing its attractiveness and finding in it enough and more than enough to interest, to stimulate, to satisfy. There is no salvation but in Christ. Only in fellowship with Him does our self-control receive adequate support. He has views of life, plans, present work in the world, which if we enter into we shall find ourselves lifted to the

right level of human life and trained to all that is best in human nature. It is in Christ's service you find true life and true freedom and true manhood.

Another detail in which self-control must be exercised is in the books we read. During the last few years our literature has undergone a most undesirable change. Books which twenty or even ten years ago would have been kept under lock and key, and would certainly have been on sale nowhere outside Holywell Street, are now obtruded upon us on almost every bookseller's counter. French novels, whose main attraction is their indecency, are translated and sold in thousands—a symptom of degenerate taste and of that pruriency which marks an unwholesome and undersized nature. Even a more alarming symptom of our degeneracy is that so many of our own novelists adopt so much of the French views of life as may be supposed to attract English readers, so that now you will see in Christian families, and read by all the members of the household, stories the plot of which is offensive to decency. Yet so subtle and insidious is this moral taint that attaches to a large part of our literature, that many readers are unconscious of its presence, not because to the pure all things are pure, but because they who have for a while breathed a bad atmosphere are insensible to its offensiveness. Happily, English literature is rich enough to make it quite unnecessary for us to open one suspected volume. Form your taste on Scott and Thackeray, Carlyle and Emerson, and you will have no relish for unclean and corrupting literature. Here again, if you feel you are losing something by not reading what others read, exercise self-control, and remember that what you lose is well lost, a tainted mind, a lowered tone, a polluted imagination, while you gain self-respect, manliness, and purity.

But again, those who have too much self-respect to find any attraction in such undesirable knowledge, sometimes show a similar craving, but in a higher and purer sphere. It is not uncommon to meet with persons who have a silly ambition to be recognized as having passed through a severe struggle with doubt and spiritual perplexity. To have never trespassed beyond the pale of orthodox belief is in some circles counted tame. If we believe what our fathers believed, we seem to stand convicted of dulness of perception, of a slow conservatism that must fall a victim to the malaria of its own stagnation. We feel a desire to experience the doubts of which we hear other men speak; we feel as if it were dis-

creditable to our understanding not to have passed through this mental phase.

Now there are two kinds of doubt which are very different in their origin and character, and which must be treated differently. There is the doubt which is almost invariably begotten in a strong and independent mind when that mind first applies itself to the solution of the mysteries of nature, of life, and of God. There is also the doubt which is assumed, like any other manner or habit which finds favour in society; sometimes there is an affectation of weariness and ennui, sometimes of indifference, and so in some circles there is an affectation of doubt. It is "the thing" to talk disparagingly of traditional belief, and to assume a sceptical attitude toward miracles and other objects of faith. The fictitious or imitative doubter may always be distinguished from the true doubter by his frivolous and ignorant manner of meeting proposed solutions of his doubts. He who merely apes doubt and seems to consider it a desirable mental condition, shrinks from conviction and seeks to perpetuate his uncertainty. To such as fancy that sceptical difficulties are symptoms of enlightenment, may be commended the words of the great philosopher who may be said to have consecrated doubt. After describing how he stripped himself one by one of all beliefs, he goes on to say: "For all that, I did not imitate the sceptics who doubt for doubting's sake, and pretend to be always undecided; on the contrary, my whole intention was to arrive at certainty, and to dig away the drift and sand until I arrived at the rock beneath" (Descartes in Huxley, 122).

This is the attitude of the true doubter. He doubts that he may arrive at the truth. He questions all his beliefs that he may be sure he holds no error. He has no desire or purpose to remain in doubt, but from his very anxiety to be sure of the truth questions and tests all he has been taught. For such doubt one can have nothing but sympathy; and where there is no vainglorious and ignorant bluster about our advanced age, but a reverential remembrance of the attainments of the past, a modest and honest scepticism regarding much that was believed in the past may not only be pardoned, but commended. For indeed our beliefs must in many respects be altered, and while we find no fault with those who accept all they have been taught, neither do we find fault with those who see that for them this is impossible. It is not through the understanding so much as through the conscience and the heart that a man becomes a Chris-

tian. And so long as any one is loyal to Christ because he is conscious that in Him he is brought into harmony with God, and because he desires to live in fellowship with Christ and to serve Him, it is not essential that he should believe all that he has been taught. There is room in the Church of Christ for questioning spirits as for docile and credulous spirits; and as there is work for the one class, so is there work for the other. What is wanted much more than acceptance of traditional belief is tolerance, based on the clear perception that many articles of our creed are not certain, and that thoughtful men cannot but have different opinions regarding their truth.

While urging self-control in these various particulars, I am more keenly sensible than any of you how idle it is to *speak*, to attempt to tame strong and wild passions by good advice, to lead leviathan by a nose-hook; to preserve you from pain and the haunting misery of a mistaken and wasted life by telling you of dangers you cannot believe in. I know that though I could read your future in your present as it is certainly contained in your present, and though I could accurately and vividly describe it, that would not keep you from following your bent. It takes ever so little to make shipwreck of a life; one point of the compass makes all the difference between success and destruction. The spring of safety and happiness lies deeper than man can go. Christ spoke an absolute truth when He said, "Without Me ye can do nothing." Without Him we can see some of our sins and fight against them, and if they be sins that threaten our social position or our reputation we can avoid and overcome them; but sins which are hidden from men or little thought of by them, sins which lurk in the heart and make us worldly and ungodly and sensual, these gather strength in spite of all we can do, unless we have the aid of Christ's fellowship.

I believe it is this which explains the melancholy fact that so many well-intentioned, and in a sense Christian people, fall into serious sin. I believe it is this which explains why sins which are fought against and which form the staple of a man's warfare against sin, go on acquiring strength until they burst upon him with an accumulation of misery and ruin which he little thought of when he thoughtlessly and almost innocently let the habit form. Until we fight against sin as the allies and subjects of Christ, as well as for our own sake, we seem to fight not in Christ's strength, but in our own. And if we think of our sin

as mainly our affair, if we hate it mainly for the shame it brings upon us, then when we are tempted by it and when our own view of it is changed, the advantage and pleasure of it being now clear and the shame of it remote and dimly seen, there is absolutely nothing to restrain us from it. But if we habitually live with Christ and consider His will in all things, and that our sin brings grief to Him, when we are tempted, though our own view of sin is altered, we are conscious that His view of it remains the same, and in sympathy with His judgment we also condemn it.

I suppose every one of you is conscious of some sin, of something that lowers you in your own eyes, and that sometimes makes you fear it is stronger than you are, and may carry you into a future of the darkest and saddest kind. There is, may I not say, something in the character or life of each of you which must be removed ere you can be all you ought to be. If so, what business more urgently calls you, or when accomplished will give you a truer satisfaction and set your feet free for future attainment and enjoyment, than to clear away this recognized and growing evil? Could you have any truer joy this day than to be able to say that the thing which most troubled and threatened you has been removed? Why should you not have this happiness, say, in a year hence? Deal seriously with these serious things—look forward to what awaits you in life. Be perfectly sure that through sin lies no path to happiness, that every step you take on that road must be retraced with the shaming conviction that you have been a fool. Each part of life has its own duties and its own opportunities, and at no future period can you come back into the past and make up for bygone omissions. The future periods have their own tasks, and are so filled with what is proper to them that what has been left undone in a former period cannot now be attended to. You are permanently crippled for life in that omitted particular. It is in life as in a college curriculum: things are arranged in a progressive order, the first steps fitting for those which succeed. If a student idle through his mathematical year he finds himself unable to face the higher studies for which mathematics are necessary. And if he tries to go back upon his course and repair his neglect, then his strength is wasted and his attention diverted from the studies which now demand his entire energy. So it is in life. Every evil habit you suffer to find place in you lowers your energy throughout life, weights and burdens you, and

holds you back from what you aspire to. The sin you admit into your life is not like a stone in a horse's hoof, that cripples for a few steps but can easily be knocked out and leave no trace: it is a morbid growth, it is in your blood, it taints your whole system, and is a weakness to the end. Turn then from all that is low, and defiling, and secretive, and ungenerous, turn from what is ungodly—be sure you are gladly living under the great law of human life, dependence on Jesus Christ, and with Him there will enter your life "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, . . . just, . . . pure, . . . lovely, . . . of good report."

EDITORIALS ON THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE IN THE REPRESENTATIVE LONDON CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEWSPAPERS.

From *The Church Times* (High Church), November 28, 1890.

I.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S OLIVE BRANCH.

MUCH as we have disliked the course which the Archbishop of Canterbury has felt it his duty to take in regard to the charges made against the Bishop of Lincoln, and strenuously as we have protested against the popish principles upon which his claims to spiritual jurisdiction as sole judge in the case rest, we freely and frankly admit that the careful and learned argument of his Grace has taken us by surprise as being apparently a most important step toward the removal of what seemed the almost hopeless deadlock in the relations between Church and State, and toward the peaceful solution of the disputes about the Ritual of the English Church.

We do not like to appear to receive ungraciously a Judgment which is in all essential points favourable to those whom we represent; but we feel it our duty still to be careful to maintain that the Judgment is of no spiritual validity. Our first and chief reason for this is that we believe it wrong to accept any new jurisdiction which the Head of the Church has not given, whatever temporary advantages may appear to be associated with it. This argument is of such overwhelming force that it excludes the possibility of our seriously weighing the apparent advantages and disadvantages of such jurisdiction: but even if it were not so, the probable ultimate consequences of accepting,

not only the present, but any possible future Archbishop as sole judge in such matters are so serious that they may well induce the most ardent admirers of the present Archbishop, or even, considering the mode of appointment of Bishops, the most enthusiastic supporters of autocratic ecclesiastical rule, to pause before committing the Province to all the possible or probable decisions on doctrine and ritual of any possible or probable future Archbishop. We therefore refuse to regard the Judgment as an official and binding utterance of the Archbishop, and we proceed to discuss it as his Grace's personal opinion and nothing more, although as such it must and ought to have great weight and receive very serious consideration. Regarding it in this light, although it does not commend itself to us as entirely satisfactory on every point, we cannot withhold a deserved tribute of respectful admiration, especially when we consider the difficult circumstances surrounding the position of the Archbishop, the obvious intention of the Judgment to promote peace in the Church without sacrificing truth, the painful care and study bestowed upon it, and the probable success of this honest endeavour.

The Judgment, being evidently the result of wide reading and large-minded consideration of a difficult subject, provides material for prolonged and careful study, and throws fresh light upon many disputed points. A stronger case might perhaps have been made out, from our point of view, for some of the points allowed, and the decision on other points might have been different, if greater stress had been laid upon the fact that the English Church is but a part of the One Catholic Church, and that her directions and rules must be interpreted on Catholic principles, with due reference to the use of other parts of the Church. This principle is admitted in one place by the recognition of the lawfulness of what is "a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church." But the principle is applied in the Judgment more in its negative aspect to the exclusion of disallowed points than in its positive aspect to the inclusion of allowed points. There is in this way a certain Protestant bias in the Judgment, although it must be acknowledged that the Archbishop has been careful to avoid all appearance of it. We have no right to assume that he has any personal bias, and least of all that he has any Protestant bias. Yet by the force of this tendency the Judgment becomes in effect something of a compromise. We do not impute to the Archbishop the intention of making a compromise. On the contrary,

it is probably the result of the necessities of the case arising out of the circumstances in which he found himself placed.

The success of the Archbishop's endeavour to provide a peaceful solution of the dispute about Ritual depends upon the acceptance of the Judgment by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council when the questions come before it either in appeal from this decision, or in any future case that may come before it in the brief space that we hope remains before its place is taken by a competent Ecclesiastical Court. A Judgment based simply upon Catholic and canonical principles would not be likely to commend itself to the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Archbishop has been apparently careful to argue on such lines as would be acceptable to them, and it is difficult to see how they can fail to maintain his decision on the points allowed. They will have before them a far more complete case than from the circumstances of the position has been possible hitherto; and if, as is probable, they are convinced by the argument of the Archbishop, it will be a very distinct gain in reference to the prospects of peace; for there will be very little left for the Persecution Company to contend for. On this account, while we are sorry that the Archbishop has felt it right to claim jurisdiction as sole judge in the case, we are hopeful that good may come out of this evil; and we feel that, although the Judgment would not entirely satisfy us if we believed it to come from a court having spiritual jurisdiction, it is under the circumstances, in its most important features, calculated to meet the difficulties of the position in regard to the probable action of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and we therefore welcome it as a whole, taking it for what we have declared we believe it to be, as holding out a fair prospect of a peaceful solution of the Ritual disputes that have so long agitated the Church, and interfered with the progress of true spiritual work.

When the Judgment is examined in detail, there are found points which require more minute and exhaustive criticism than there is room for within the limits of this article. We can only touch upon the details here in a very general and superficial manner.

One thing we are very thankful for is the fact that, with one possible exception, the requirement that the manual acts must be seen by the congregation, which appears at first sight to substitute a south-eastward for the eastward position, which we believe to

be the Archbishop's personal practice, and the whole of which question we must deal with more fully on another occasion, there is no point condemned which is so indisputably of truly Catholic usage as to be regarded as essential. The arguments for the lawfulness of the Eucharistic Lights, the Mixed Chalice, the Ablutions, and the eastward position, unless qualified as already referred to, are irresistible; and our hands will be greatly strengthened by an argument on these points from the most rigidly Anglican, not to say insular standpoint, which must carry conviction with it to all unprejudiced minds. These are points of Catholic usage, which no part of the Church can decide for itself, and which, therefore, no Anglican authority could forbid. The Archbishop, who referred in his Judgment to the force of local usage, would probably admit this. Such minor points as the time and place of mixing the chalice, and the question when the Sign of the Cross is to be used, are matters which may be decided by local authority, so that if the Archbishop had that authority which he claims, but which we maintain only belongs to the Provincial Synod, little fault could be found with his Judgment, except that legislation, as the Archbishop lays down, should never take place under the guise of judicial interpretation.

The Archbishop gave a masterly historical analysis of the interpretation of the expression "North End," as applied to the position of the celebrant at the commencement of the service, and his arguments, it will be noted, cover the contention of those who, adopting the old English rule, commence the service at the Southern part of the West side. The Archbishop readily accepts the fact that literal compliance with the rubric in its original sense is impossible. We gratefully notice the repudiation of the theory that omission implies prohibition, though we cannot quite follow the Archbishop when he says that a ceremony that was not in use before the Reformation must in all cases be unlawful if not explicitly ordered, so that there can be no development or formation of use. We do not allude to unmeaning imitations of foreign customs which are inconsistent with the structure or rubrics of our own Liturgy; but to reasonable customs which may be formed on Catholic principles in accordance with our own written law, and which may or may not be practised in other parts of the Church. It has been very justly said that some people hold that the English Church died in 1662, and left a will of which the lawyers are the executors and trustees. The

Archbishop claimed that the English Church has a certain power (we are not sure how much) to order and change ceremonies. We agree with him so far that as a true living part of the Church she has power to order and change ceremonies, subject to the wider authority of the whole Church, and that not only by way of legislation, but by way of custom or use.

We have space only very briefly to ask attention to one or two other weak points in the Judgment which need to be pointed out lest some should be led to regard all the conclusions as sound by the display of learning shown on most points. And here we must notice that where we cannot agree with the conclusions arrived at, it is easy for the most part to show that the Judgment is inconsistent with itself.

For instance, the Archbishop, having shown by an elaborate argument that there was a sufficient reason for ordering the Breaking of the Bread "before the people" in the ordinary sense of "*coram populo*," the very sense in which the promoters of the suit use the expression "before the people" in the charge in reference to the ablutions, nevertheless, without any grounds alleged, except the statement that "the tenor of the Common Prayer is openness," orders that the fraction is to be in sight of the people, although he has elsewhere laid down that where expressions are of doubtful interpretation, no reasonable interpretation is to be excluded. It is also to be noticed that the Revisers did not, as the Archbishop himself points out, take the words suggested by the Puritan divines "in the sight of," but Bishop Cosin's words "before the people." If, as the Archbishop says in another place, the omission of the direction to mix water with the wine at the time of the offertory shows intention that the mixing was not to take place there, then on the same principle the deliberate use of the words "before the people," instead of the suggested words "in the sight of the people" must be taken to imply that the words used were not intended to have the meaning of "in the sight of the people." Again, if the argument that "the tenor of the Common Prayer is openness" is to override all other considerations in one place, it ought to prevail in regard to the mixing of the chalice, which, however, the Archbishop, with singular inconsistency, seems to argue should be done secretly. The last word has not been said on these points, and we propose to return to them with a view to throwing fresh light upon them by the help of the Archbishop's arguments, in accord-

ance with the principle laid down in the Judgment that it does not claim to have established finality, and that its conclusions are subject to the introduction of fresh light.

In spite of the criticisms which we have felt bound to make, and which we have endeavoured to set forth with all due respect to the Archbishop, we are thankful that the Judgment marks a new departure in ecclesiastical controversy, and shows considerable progress in the acceptance of Catholic truth.

We conclude with an earnest exhortation to our friends to lay to heart the fact, rightly insisted upon by many Bishops, that the Judgment does not profess to affect directly any one except the Bishop of Lincoln, and not to act hastily upon it in any direction. Nothing would, in our opinion, be more disastrous than a general rash adoption of the points of ritual which are in the opinion of the Archbishop lawful. Nothing would be so likely to provoke this as hasty compliance with the Archbishop's suggestions in the other direction. Such ill-considered action would, in all probability, utterly destroy, or, at least, indefinitely postpone, the hopes of peace held out by the new turn of events. We plead earnestly that, while the Archbishop's argument calls for careful and earnest study, no action may be taken rashly upon it by those whom it does not directly affect, because we are confident that hasty action in either direction would be extremely mischievous, and would defeat the very end which the Archbishop evidently has in view, the prevention of litigation and the promotion of peace. At the same time, those who have already adopted the disputed points, or who may, in the course of time, see their way on right principles to their adoption, will find their hands strengthened by this expression of opinion on the part of one so highly respected and filling such a dignified post as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

II.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

From *The Guardian* (Conservative), November 26, 1890.

THE anxiety with which Churchmen waited for the judgment in this great case was twofold. It concerned alike the manner and the matter of the decision. In the former regard, questions were astir whether the judgment would be such as should proceed from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the successor of St. Augustine and St. Anselm, the Primate of an historic Church;

whether it would be true to Catholic tradition, in the grounds on which it rested, in the authority to which it yielded deference, in the evidence it afforded of a liberty in things spiritual uncompromised and unfringed by secular control; whether it would possess those qualities of strength and thoroughness and distinction which men honour anywhere, but demand in acts of this importance. And in the latter regard, concerning the contents of the judgment, there was a wide anxiety, with varying emphasis, as to the verdict which would be pronounced on each of the nine charges brought against the Bishop of Lincoln by the promoters of the suit.

In its character and manner—let it be frankly and thankfully acknowledged—the judgment leaves very little to be desired. It is a document which may hold a high place among the records of ecclesiastical judicature; it is conceived and worked out in a way which brings new hope into the aspect of affairs. In an age when hesitation and faint-heartedness are apt to take the place of statesmanship, the Archbishop of Canterbury has done a more courageous thing than any prelate has even attempted for many years. In an age of hasty talk and general impressions he has taken ample time to consider and elaborate his decision, and the judgment which he read on Friday last shows how well the time has been employed. In thorough and exact inquiry, in care for detail, in justice of thought, in clearness of statement, in candour and ability and force, it is a work of rare excellence; while there is no room for reasonable doubt as to the reality of the freedom with which the evidence is examined and the verdict formed on each successive point. The judgment is genuinely and plainly the judgment of the Archbishop and his Assessors; substantially it might have stood as it is had no other Court attempted to deal with any of the questions at issue.

Such is the character of this vigorous and weighty utterance; and no misgiving as to that which has preceded or may follow it ought to make men grudging in their recognition of its intrinsic merit and significance. But with regard to the decisions reached upon the contested points, it is more difficult to speak either briefly or with unhindered satisfaction. For the greater part of the judgment High Churchmen have good reason to be glad, far better reason probably than most of them expected; at point after point one feels how much the security of their position is advanced by the more thorough and appreciative study which at last

has been given to the evidence. But, unhappily, as the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, so the practical worth and hopefulness of a complex scheme which is meant for wide acceptance does not rise above its most unpromising element. And there is something very unpromising in the ruling of the Court, that in the consecration of the Holy Eucharist "the manual acts must be performed in such wise as to be visible to the communicants properly placed." If the judgment fails to bear the part it ultimately should bear in the furtherance of the Church's cause, it will fail by reason of these words. For they bring in a novel practice or gesture in the case of all who take the eastward position; in conception, in tone of thought, in scientific character and dignity, they seem to fall plainly below the level of the work with which they stand; they demand what will to many seem an untimely deference to an unreasonable suspicion; they may come to be much misused by the perverse and capacious; and they will in many cases force men to recall, in the most awful moment of their ministerial action, the thoughts which then, at all events, they long to banish. It is not, indeed, impossible to conform to the ruling without swerving from the eastward position; but it is not natural, nor is it by any means easy to decide how it may best be done. And in view of the extreme importance which, both in relation to the due fulfilment of the Sacramental Mystery, and also by the whole tenour of the Church's law, belongs to the manual acts, it does not seem wise or fair to impose a requirement such as that embodied in the judgment, without facing the practical difficulties which will be found in obeying it, and without giving clear and full direction as to the way in which those difficulties are to be met; while it is likely that, if the ruling of the Court comes to be enforced, some may devise ways of complying with it by which grave trouble may be provoked. It seems a grievous pity that the judgment should be hampered by the disadvantage and disfigurement which this one decision introduces into it, and that the Archbishop has let slip the opportunity of saying simply that the time has not yet come for any absolute determination as to the position of the Celebrant at the Altar; and that both positions, the eastward and the southward, ought in justice for the present to be recognized and sanctioned. We believe that the simplicity and equity of such a statement, indisputably warranted by the evidence which the Archbishop has adduced, would

have secured from men of all parties, and of none, a degree of deference which is hardly likely to be commanded by an utterance which attaches to the recognition of the eastward position a requirement so awkward and unhistorical that it may go far to spoil the character and outcome of the decision on this point.

With regard to the line which the Bishop of Lincoln may pursue, we can have nothing to express save a deep gratitude that, at what can hardly fail to prove an eventful moment in the Church's history, the first and most conspicuous determination has to be formed by one who is quite sure to act with a pure and single purpose; one who is as far removed from impatience as he is from fear; one who will command and warrant the utmost trust of all who know him. But with regard to the extension of that personal bearing which is as yet all that properly belongs to the Archbishop's judgment, a few words may be here said.

It has been often urged in these columns that, whatever the judgment might be, it would have no bearing upon the duty of individual priests save where it was in some regular way communicated or promulgated to them by their own Bishop. It is greatly to be desired that the measure of reserve and patience which is thus indicated may be generally exercised. It is due to the Archbishop that the example of deliberate and painstaking thought which he has set should be followed in the sequel of his work. It is due to the Episcopate that the right of every Bishop himself to give directions to his own clergy should be steadily respected. The court from which this judgment comes may in some future age produce another of a very different character; and then the safety of the Church may depend upon the sheltering power of that diocesan authority which would be ignored if the clergy were in the present case to regard themselves as taking their instructions directly from the chair of Canterbury. Moreover, a newspaper report can hardly be treated as a canonical vehicle for the exercise of the Episcopal office in the guidance of the Church's action. The next step in the very difficult and perilous course which the Archbishop's judgment may prove to have initiated for the Church must be taken by the Bishops severally, by each on his own responsibility, for his own diocese. What that step should be they have by-and-by to settle; and it is a question which demands great prudence and calmness and consideration for its right solution. When the Bishops speak, a new stage in the long crisis

will have come ; but until they speak it can hardly be doubted that the duty of the clergy is to wait. A certain number of people will probably rush at the Archbishop's judgment with the same tumultuous and troublesome impetuosity which sometimes brings an unhappy crowd to precipitate and misunderstand and interrupt the work which a man of science knows that he can only carry forward if he is left to give to it in his laboratory all the time it needs. But it may be hoped that the majority of Churchmen will show in the present instance somewhat more of a reasonable and respectful patience ; owning very thankfully that the hard work and sincerity and ability of the Archbishop and his Assessors have given to the Church of England a document so strong and honest that it can hardly fail to bear fruit for good ; but remembering that the surest and the commonest way to waste and ruin such a gift is to try to make it bear its fruit before its time has come.

III.

JUDGMENT AT LAST.

From *The Rock* (Low Church), November 28, 1890.

THE Archbishop's judgment has the merit of satisfying nobody. Its unique cleverness is in having defined the word "wine" in the English language as identical with wine *plus* water, and in having declared that candles lit during the broad daylight are not lit for any ceremonial purpose. The Archbishop does not condescend to instruct us about the purpose for which they are lighted. Of the seven charges, the Bishop of Lincoln has been acquitted upon five and convicted upon two. He is enjoined to so consecrate the elements that the manual acts may "be visible to the communicants properly placed," and he must not make the sign of the Cross, either in giving the Absolution or the final Benediction. He may have the *Agnus Dei* sung before the reception of the elements ; he may adopt the eastward position ; he may mix water with the sacramental wine provided he does it before the service, and either in the vestry or at a credence table ; he may perform the ablutions after the service with such attendant function as he pleases ; and he may have, as we have mentioned already, two lights on the Communion-table, "when not wanted for the purpose of giving light," "nothing having been performed or done, which comes under the definition of a ceremony, by the presence

2

of two still lights alight before it begins and until after it ends." We apologize to our readers for what may be an undignified attitude toward a solemn and a weighty judgment, but we are driven to it in the very bitterness of our heart, when we think we see the most sacred institutions and services treated in the piteously trivial spirit in which the Archbishop's judgment has dealt with them. If his Grace had intended to bring contempt upon the whole business he could not have done so more effectually. One omission we notice ; he does not appear to have read the Homilies. Possibly they are too modern history for him.

Naturally, the Archbishop leaned as much toward the advanced Church party as he conscientiously could. His sympathies are drawn thitherward. It was to be expected that he would do what he could to screen an episcopal brother, and to let him down as gently as he could. Thus he gave no costs in the cause ; he pronounced no sentence upon the Bishop ; and he made nasty reflections upon the witnesses. They are no more "hired" because they are paid than his Grace is "hired" because he has his salary of 15,000*l.* a year. There must be technical witnesses where technical testimony is demanded, and such witnesses are no more deserving of animadversion than professional witnesses would be in other cases. Before such an elaborate ceremonial as we now have the ordinary uninstructed worshipper is bewildered, and his evidence would soon break down under the astute cross-examination of wily counsel. We do not like these prosecutions, and therefore would rather they were not preferred. But we cannot allow those who are of another opinion to be abused as though they were mean spies and low detectives because they do that which in their consciences they believe to be for the public good. We understand that there is to be an appeal to the Privy Council, so that after all this tedious litigation we are just where we were. Nevertheless, we doubt if the Bishop of Lincoln's friends are altogether comforted, although they have been so abundantly blessed. Will they be pleased at an acquittal on the score that these ceremonies are not ceremonies, and have no particular significance ? The more strenuous spirits among them have always contended that their ritual was insisted upon because of its teaching efficacy. It will scarcely please them to be told so by a "spiritual court." How will the following sentences from the judgment gratify them ? "The Court decides that the mixing of the wine in, and as a part of the service is against the

law of the Church." "It would have been illegal to vary the service by making 'the Ceremony of Ablution' charged in the Articles." In the Jewish ritual the shedding of the blood was at that place which lay "on the side of the altar toward the north." The position of the celebrant does not "convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine." The *Agnus Dei* may not be "the aptest anthem for use here." "To condemn the singing of that text here as unsound in doctrine would be contrary to the real force of Ridley's injunction, and to other unexceptionable Protestant teaching."

The Church Association have issued advance sheets of an article on the judgment, which article will be published in the December number of their *Church Intelligencer*. They complain about the Archbishop's setting aside the judgments of the Privy Council. These judgments decided that altar-lights are illegal, and could not hold that "if the mingling and administering in the service water and wine is an additional ceremony, and so unlawful, it becomes lawful by removing from the service the act of mingling." The Church Association stigmatize the judgment as a "New Light" judgment, and criticise in detail its historical inaccuracies. For example, the Archbishop quotes Burnet as stating that great contests arose in 1550 as to whether the table should be placed "lengthwise" or "crosswise," although these words, "lengthwise" and "crosswise," marked by the Archbishop with quotation marks, were never "heard of at that period." They also charge the Archbishop with having had in his selection of authorities a preference for partisan writers, and they allege that the eastward position "from 1552 to our own day was never once used by any one clergyman as a habit, or for other than temporary reasons of a personal, exceptional, or local character." In conclusion, they assert that this judgment, "so far from adducing much 'new light,' is remarkable for the mere *rechauffé* which it furnishes of materials from Chambers, Scudamore, and Morton Shaw."

The one value of the judgment will be that it will divert public attention from mere Ritual details to central doctrines. It will serve to show how small and capricious are these various ceremonies, signifying one set of ideas to one set of minds, and a totally different set of ideas to another class of thinkers. They are but banners and flags, whose symbolism is arbitrary, and therefore may vary in different hands and according to

different usages. We know well enough and sadly enough what they are intended to teach as they are used in our churches now. But it is always a puzzling matter to affix in a law court the exact shade of intention, and in a criminal trial, where English habit affords the accused every loophole, it is easy for the defendant to elude justice. We are thankful that these Episcopal assessors one and all felt themselves bound to repudiate Roman doctrine. *Corruptio optimi pessima*, but the degeneration of our Church of England has not become such that an Archbishop could defiantly assume and defend Roman doctrine. We cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that clerical judges can never be impartial ones upon clerical questions. They will, quite unconsciously to themselves, but nevertheless really, reflect their own clerical bias. History will always be construed into what the student wishes. A Froude can whitewash Henry VIII., a Carlyle can manufacture a saint out of Cromwell. Most learned is the Archbishop's little thesis; we only wish it had in it more of the spirit of those which Luther nailed on the church door at Wittenberg.

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, November 1, 1890.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.

IN closing this series of papers, it is right to record the admission that they can lay no claim to anything more than touching, and that slightly, certain parts of a great subject. They omit many things important, perhaps some things essential. The paper on the Creation Story, indeed, aims at bringing out what seems to me a distinct and specific argument in proof of a Divine Revelation. Except in that instance, their main design is to draw out, so far as they go, the force of that cumulative evidence witnessing to such a Revelation, which has been so wisely summed up by Bishop Butler;* and also to disembarass belief in it from those difficulties which properly belong, not to itself, but to exaggerations and excrescences against which it can carry no absolute guarantee. They form the testimony of an old man, in the closing period

* "Analogy," Part II., Chap. VII.

of his life. It is rendered with no special qualification but possibly this one. Few men of our British race have lived through a longer period of incessant argumentative contention, or have had a more diversified experience in trying to ascertain, for purposes immediately practical, the difference between tenable and untenable positions. Such experience is directly conversant with the nature of man and his varied relations; and I own my inclination to suppose that it is more germane to the treatment of subjects that lie directly between collective man and the Author of his being, more calculated to neutralize deficiencies, though not to impart capacity, than a familiarity with those material sciences which have supplied an arena for, perhaps, the most splendid triumphs of the century now far advanced in its decline. On this subject has been recorded the nobly candid admission of Mr. Darwin* respecting the possible atrophy, through disuse, of the mental organs on which our higher tastes depend. Among those organs I cannot but include the organ of belief. On this subject, however, I am a biased witness. It is for others to judge. I only offer a plea, not in proof of ability, but in extenuation of defect.

There is in certain circles a very confident disposition to assert that, as regards belief in supernaturalism, the intellectual battle has been fought and won, and that victory is on the side of negation. It ought to be observed, before proceeding further, that supernaturalism is a term which includes the idea of God. A sense may be, indeed, loosely given to it, which confines it to the mode of his manifestations. But, essentially, if God be there, the supernatural is there; and the developments which proceed from that idea, even if they had been crushed and stamped out, might germinate again. It is not, then, a question of excrecences or of details; the life and essence of religion are at stake. It is the question of belief in what is not perhaps scientifically, but yet intelligibly, termed a personal God.

I shall presently enter on the moral causes which may have contributed, and even mainly contributed, to stimulate the negative tendencies of the day. I am now only endeavoring partially to test the justice of a *Pæan*, which is not warranted even by the established fact of a victory; it must be a victory belonging to that class of victories which end the war.

That such a song is raised, there can be little doubt. It seems to have inspired the

recent Articles of that very distinguished and not less upright writer, Professor Huxley, in the Nineteenth Century. But I have never seen a better example of the plenary satisfaction which possesses the mind of many negative athletes than in the following passage, taken from a writer of ability:

"I set out from the standpoint that the mission of Freethought is no longer to batter down old faiths. That has been long ago effectively accomplished; and I, for one, am ready to put a railing round the ruins, that they may be preserved from desecration, and serve as a landmark! Indeed, I confess to having yawned over a recent vigorous indictment of Christianity."*

This purports to be a description of a certain state of facts!† Now, it is not the first time that we have heard description of the kind. Such a description was supplied in the following lines by no less a person than Bishop Butler, who, I apprehend, was not among those given to exaggeration. His words are these:‡

"It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."§

It seems pretty plain that at the time when the Bishop published the *Analogy*,§ a wave of unbelief was passing over the land. The spiritual declension of the Hanoverian period had set in; and the standard of life, and of the ideas current concerning life, was sinking almost from day to day. The negative movement of the period may have been quite as vigorous, as widespread, and as self-confident, as that of which we now feel the pressure. Yet it dwindled, and almost disappeared; and we may even say that, at the time of Johnson's social predominance, it left hardly a trace behind.¶ Nor was this either the first or the last of the reverses which negation has suffered. At the time of the great Renaissance, of an-

* Karl Pearson, "Ethics of Free Thought," Preface, p. 5. The dramatic character of this declaration is brought to its climax by the fact that the work is dedicated to the members of King's College, Cambridge.

† It is far from being isolated. The same ideas are expressed with greater vehemence by Dr. Hardwick, of Sheffield, in a preface to "Evolution," London, 1880.

‡ From the Advertisement to the "Analogy."

§ In 1726.

¶ In 1797, when Wilberforce published his "Practical View," he spoke of "absolute unbelievers" as a class which he feared was an increasing one (Chap. VII., sec. 3). Perhaps the great war of the years 1793-1815 tended to debilitate the religious mind of the country by drawing off mental force in another direction. I have, however, heard from persons of high authority, who were old when I was young, that the French Revolution generated a distinctly religious reaction on this side of the Channel.

cient learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the cultivated mind of Europe sank far back into Paganism; but that ebb was succeeded by a flowing tide. Again, in my own earlier days, say in the second quarter of the present century, there was a great revival both of the dogmatic sense and of the religious life in England; and the temper of the time, in the thinking world, was strongly adverse alike to worldliness, to indifference, and to unbelief. In the third quarter, however, the sceptical movement set in with a wide and subtle power. No man, perhaps, was better qualified to pass a judgment on this subject than the late Dr. Whewell; and he, writing in November, 1853, and referring to an opinion expressed by a contemporary of smaller calibre than himself, says, "As to his assertion that scepticism is increasing, it is contrary to all my knowledge of the cultivated classes."* History, then, seems to prove that these negative movements are subject, not only to a hazard, but even to a law of mutation; and that every one of them, when it has done its work, may cease to be. Of one thing we may be assured: such a movement derives no real strength, no true promise of permanence, from an overweening self-assertion. The question is not what negation thinks of itself and of the opposing forces, but what is the intrinsic strength of the reasoning on which it rests.

I have said that, when it has done its work, it may cease to be. For doubtless it has a work to do. The wave that breaks and foams upon the rock exhibits to us not merely, as it might seem, a picture of violence and a source of danger, but a fraction of the vast oceanic movement, which is the indispensable condition of health and purity both to the water and the air, and to the populations by which they are respectively inhabited. If we believe in Providential government, we might rationally believe, even where we did not see, that those boastful, and even powerful, agencies, are not without their purposes prefigured, and bounded, too, in the counsels of God. It seems, however, not difficult to discern a portion of those purposes; which may have been, first, to dispel the lethargy and stimulate the zeal of believers; and, secondly, to admonish their faith to keep terms with reason, by testing it at all its points; lest fancy, or pride, or indolence, or the intolerant spirit of sect or party, should have imported into their beliefs merely human elements that it may be very needful to eject.

Whether it be in blindness or not, the champions of negation ought to understand that it remains just as possible now as it was in the early or middle ages, to uphold belief in perfect good faith and with immovable conviction. In the advance of scientific knowledge, and of the critical art, I for one see much that corrects and chastens our persuasions concerning the subjects of belief, but nothing that disintegrates or undermines the basis of belief itself.

It is sometimes taken for granted, or alleged, that religion or its champions are reduced to the necessity of defending their cause only with arms which have been superseded by the introduction of forces previously unknown, or by new forms of construction better adapted to their ends. In a work which seems to fluctuate between pity and a good-natured contempt, Professor Huxley describes "the old-fashioned artillery of the Churches" on the one side, and "the weapons of precision" used by the advancing forces of science on the other.* Now let it be remembered that we have not here to do with the masses of mankind, to whom historical and scientific arguments, whether negative or affirmative, are, and probably must remain, inaccessible. We are speaking of that standing army, so to call it, of more or less instructed persons, who, on the one side and the other, execute all the fighting on behalf of the community at large. Writing then of those within the palisades of the lists, and not appealing to mere numbers, I demur entirely to the statement of Professor Huxley. I deny that the weapons of belief are antiquated: I pause even before admitting that those of scientific men are always, except in their own particular sciences, weapons of precision. When we decline the appeal to the established facts of science, or to the conclusions upheld or reasonably sustained by human experience through history, or when we fall into the trap laid for us by Hume, and treat the acceptance of our "holy religion" as a matter in no way amenable to the review of reason; then we may be justly charged with the use of weapons no longer serviceable. But until then we may quietly endeavor to proceed as rational beings upon rational considerations. If these principles have not uniformly guided me in the composition of the papers I am now bringing to a close (on which it is not for me to judge), at least I can say that there has not been in any instance, even by a hair's breadth, an intentional deviation from them.

* "Life of Whewell," p. 431.

* *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1890, p. 22.

The fact, however, of a strong and widespread negative movement among our countrymen during the latter portion of this century is admitted; and now I propose to offer some remarks upon its alleged or probable causes.

I shall speak, first, of the detriment which religion is supposed to have suffered through the great and wonderful advance both of science and of rational speculation, mostly physical, but also critical, archæological, and historical.

Secondly, of the detriment it has suffered through the exposure of erroneous opinions about religion which are due to believers themselves: a detriment attending, in different manners and degrees, either the retention, or even the abandonment, of such opinions.

Thirdly, of the strength which the negation movement has in my opinion derived from causes greatly and subtly effective, and wholly extrinsic to itself; and which I take to constitute its principal strength.

Of the first head I might dispose very briefly. I have enumerated some of the great services which science has rendered, and is rendering, to religion. Of the damage it has inflicted I have heard much; but the allegations commonly appear to me upon examination to be found untrue: in some cases, like that of the first chapter of Genesis, to be not only untrue, but contradictory of the truth, as science, when just principles of interpretation are called in, is found to have established what it has been said to have destroyed.

The nearest semblance, that has attracted my notice, to palpable contradiction between modern science and Holy Writ, is upon the statement that sin brought death into the world, whereas we now know that death was antecedent to the introduction of sin. But in Scripture, beyond all dispute, the word "death" has many senses. For example, it means habitually, severance of spirit from body. It means separation from God, and domination of body over spirit.* It means reunion with God, and domination of spirit over body.† As it means the soul's disease, severance from God, so also it means the final consummation of that disease in the second death. These are the senses of the term dispersed about the Bible. How do we know that St. Paul used the words in the first of these, and not in the second? And if he had used it in the first sense, and had intended to declare that there was no physical death before the sin of Adam, how

much would this prove? Only that the apostle was ignorant of the pre-Adamite history of the world, and that we should have to ask whether such ignorance, when proved, would destroy or impair the overflowing proofs that he was commissioned of God to speak, and was taught of God how to speak, for the salvation of the world.

It remains, however, a vital portion of our duty, on the one hand, to estimate and to measure aright the differences between the Divine Revelation in itself, and the subjective conceptions entertained and propagated concerning it; and on the other to inquire pretty strictly whether the professors of science are sometimes apt to push their legitimate authority beyond their own bounds into provinces where it becomes a usurpation, and whether the weapons which they hurl are then always "weapons of precision."

On the first of these two points I will give an illustration of my meaning from the latest writings of the Achilles of the opposing army. In a very recent article, which deals chiefly with the Deluge,* Mr. Huxley, in a succinct but decided way, administers capital punishment also to the Creation Story of Genesis. He does not enter much into particulars, but he says the Israelites were like all other men curious to know their origin. Now, so far as the records of the past go, the cosmological curiosity of the ancients appears to have been small. The cosmologies of Babylon and Egypt hold an utterly insignificant place in their systems of knowledge. The Greeks, perhaps the most inquisitive of men, cared little or nothing for these things through many centuries, after they had felt the passion of high poetry and the legends associated with it; and when their schools of philosophy arose, they dealt with the origin of material things rather than of men. There was no nation, I believe, except the Israelites, whose cosmology held a classical place in their memory and in their devotions. But I am perhaps wrong in arguing the question. What I ought rather to point out is that while Professor Huxley is fond, as he well may be, of claiming to represent science, this *dictum* is entirely outside the sciences he represents.

Again, in the same short space he proceeds to lay it down that an opinion given by Dr. Riehm on the subject of the seven Mosaic days (that is, that they are natural days) should be final. We claim, however, to be, if not freethinkers, yet free thinkers. Why are we to renounce the faculty of dis-

* Luke 1: 79; John 8: 51; Eph. 2: 1.
† Col. 2: 20; 3: 3; 2 Tim. 2: 11.

* Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 21.

course, to square our minds to those of Dr. Riehm, to let him do the thinking for us, and to accept his words as "final"? Simply because Mr. Huxley has said so. What right has Professor Huxley to close this question? For the question whether the Creation Story of Genesis describes solar days or not, is no more a scientific question, than whether Parliament should or should not meet in November, or whether Shakespeare wrote or did not write the whole of "Henry VIII."

But I have now to ask whether the weapons used by this most distinguished scientist are always "weapons of precision"? On scientific grounds he condemns, as we have seen, the narrative of the Deluge, and pronounces it to be fabulous. One of his reasons is this. The Mosaic account assigns a period of one hundred and fifty days (the Tablets give only seven) for the subsidence of the waters. Against this statement Mr. Huxley advances a *dictum*, of which the subject-matter is unquestionably scientific. He gives the length of the Mesopotamian plain* at three to four hundred miles, and the elevation of the higher end at five to six hundred feet. Had this plain been so covered with water, says Mr. Huxley, a "furious torrent" would have rushed downward, and instead of a hundred and fifty days the plain generally (this word no doubt is meant to except particular hollows) would have been left bare in a very few hours.

Let us try this question a little more nearly. If the length of the plain be 350 miles, and the fall 525 feet, we have a descent of one foot and a half per mile; and this descent, says the Professor, would cause a furious torrent, such as would clear the plain in a very few hours. Let us assume twenty miles an hour as the rate of the "furious torrent," on which assumption the plain would be bare in seventeen and a half hours. I take these rates and figures so as to translate approximately into definite quantities Mr. Huxley's more general expressions.

One foot and a half per mile represent a gradient of $\frac{1}{256}$. I have sought information on this subject from an engineer who is in charge of a portion of one of our rivers. I understand from him that a fall of one in three thousand four hundred and twenty would probably produce a current of about two miles an hour. It may require all Professor Huxley's resources to show that a current of two miles an hour is a "furious torrent;" or that to represent as a furious

torrent what is in truth an extremely slow stream is to use a "weapon of precision."

My informant, indeed, adds that each case has modifying circumstances of its own, and must be judged by itself; but he likewise tells me that if, instead of taking an ordinary English river, we remove the banks, and suppose the stream indefinitely widened, the fall remaining the same, the rate of the current would be not increased but slackened. Thus we seem to get farther and farther from the "weapons of precision." And it seems just possible that, after all, these weapons may, either, like our monster guns, sometimes damage those who handle them, or may fail to batter down so soon as expected the undoubtedly ancient walls of the fortress of belief.*

The case to which I have last referred is one of elementary hydraulics. The obligation to be precise may be thought to rise with the elevation of the subject. If we may not ask from the scientific man that when he touches questions of the innermost feelings of believers, and of the highest destinies of man, he should be reverent, yet surely we are entitled to require of him that he should be circumspect; that he should take reasonable care to include in his survey of a case all elements which are obviously essential to a right judgment upon it.

In another recent article,† Mr. Huxley has touched very lofty ground indeed. He selects as a crucial case for the trial of the Gospels, and with them of the character of our Lord, the miracle which happened in the country of the Gergesenes, or Gadarenes. It is narrated, with certain variations, by three evangelists; the essential point being, that evil spirits, cast out from the body of a demoniac, are permitted to enter into a herd of swine, which rushes furiously into the sea. Mr. Huxley, as a physiologist, disbelieves in demoniacal possession, and that is the point that has commonly attracted the chief share of attention in connection with this miracle. Such a physiological judgment it is not for me to discuss. But he also very properly touches the question of the injury inflicted by the destruction of the swine, which was due to our Lord's permission. Mr. Huxley observes that the evangelist has no "inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case," and adds, the devils entered into the swine "to the great loss and damage of the innocent Gerasene or Gadarene pig-owners." Further, "Everything

* It is not without interest to remark that, on the data before us, the time required for clearing the plain would be about 162 hours, or nearly seven days, the actual time mentioned in the Babylonian account.

† Nineteenth Century, February, 1880, pp. 171, 172.

* Nineteenth Century, July, 1880, p. 14.

that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanor of evil example."

So, then, after eighteen centuries of worship offered to our Lord by the most cultivated, the most developed, and the most progressive portion of the human race, it has been reserved to a scientific inquirer to discover that he was no better than a law-breaker and an evil-doer. It is sometimes said that the greatest discoveries are the most simple. And this, if really a discovery, is the simplest of them all. So simple that he who runs may read, for it lies on the very surface of the page. The ordinary reader can only put the wondering question, how, in such a matter, came the honors of originality to be reserved to our time and to Professor Huxley?

Simple as it has been from his point of view, the case* is to a reflective mind a very peculiar one. It offers the only occasion on which our Lord exercised, or co-operated in the exercise of preternatural power for the destruction of life.

It is observable that in certain instances, such as that of the fig-tree, and of the ass with her colt, he seems to assert himself as the universal owner. He is the Lord to kill, as well as to make alive, according to his wisdom. But this consideration, to whatever conclusion it might lead, is of what may be termed an esoteric nature, and is hardly suited to an argument against the negative school, who are plainly entitled to raise the question as it affects the right of property. Why, then, does our Lord in this instance see cause to vary from the philanthropic and beneficent tendencies which usually mark his miraculous agency? It has been observed that the entrance into the swine may have been permitted, in order to certify the man or men relieved of the reality of the great and hardly credible deliverance. And again, that the willing departure of the demons may have spared the victim or victims from the tortures which it is natural to suppose would have attended their violent ejection. Yet something more seems to be desired in order to meet the question that has just been raised. I find the answer to it in the reasonable, and (as it seems to me) almost necessary supposition, that the possession of the swine was unlawful, and, therefore, justly punishable by their loss.

The scene is described by different evangelists in different terms. It is the country of the Gergesenes, or the country of the Gada-

renes. The distinction is immaterial to the present purpose. It was apparently part of the land of the Gergashites,* one of the seven Canaanitish nations, and was subject, therefore, as a matter of religious obligation, to the Mosaic law. Now that law contained a prohibition to use various meats, among which pork was included. But in the case of swine the law went further, and it was forbidden even to touch the carcass,† which of course precluded all use of them whatever when dead; and it was only for use when dead that there could be any object in keeping the animal. Nor was this prohibition merely ceremonial. It was immediately related to the health of the people, as the use of pork (I am informed) produces the disease called trichinosis, and I understand that the veto is down to this day regarded by well-informed Jews as of a serious importance.

Mr. Huxley, exercising his rapid judgment on the text, does not appear to have encumbered himself with the labor of inquiring what anybody else had known or said about it. He has thus missed a point which might have been set up in support of his accusation against our Lord. Some commentators have alleged the authority of Josephus for stating that Gadara was a city of Greeks rather than of Jews, from whence it might be inferred that to keep swine was innocent and lawful. This is not quite the place for a critical examination of the case; but I have examined it, and have satisfied myself that Josephus gives no reason whatever to suppose that the population of Gadara, still more the population of the neighborhood, and most of all the swineherding or lower‡ portion of that population, were other than Hebrews, bound by the Mosaic law. Now, this being the case, the punishment inflicted upon the owners of the swine, by the permission of our Lord, did not constitute a breach, but rather a vindication, of the law; as a law would be vindicated if casks of smuggled spirits were caught and broken open after landing, and their contents wasted on the ground. Surely, if these were only possibilities, instead of rather cogent likelihoods, they should have been examined and weighed before pronouncing sentence on One who, apart from all other claims, must be supposed to have had some considerable reason for deviating from his usually beneficent and

* Deut. 7: 1.

† Lev. 40: 7, 8.

‡ It is clear that such people could not be the owners of 2,000 swine. But (1) this is stated in St. Mark only; (2) it is stated in a parenthesis, whereas it would naturally appear in the direct narrative; (3) so large a number suggests the error of a copyist, or very possibly a marginal gloss.

* Matt. 8: 30; Mark 5: 2; Luke 8: 31.

gentle methods. And, again, such hand-over-head reasoning is hard to reconcile either with the judicial temper, or with the claim, nay, the exclusive claim, to the honor of using "weapons of precision."

There is yet another point of great importance, in regard to which I desire to challenge the methods pursued by some critics of the Holy Scriptures; and I cannot do better than again proceed on the Flood paper of Professor Huxley. He finds, on the one hand, a vast mass of diversified tradition which agrees in reporting a flood. He finds that, as we draw near to that central seat of civilization in Chaldea, from which Abraham probably carried the Hebrew narration, it unfolds largely into detail, and that the tradition which thus emigrated is supported in many very remarkable particulars by the narrative which has been recorded in the Tablets. Finding, however, in the Mosaic story, various statements which he deems to be irreconcilable with natural laws, he protests, not against those particular statements, but against the entire relation; and he casts aside, not only the whole tale as it is given in Genesis, but the large mass of collateral testimony from every quarter of the globe which supports it. Is this a scientific, is it a philosophical, is it altogether a rational, method of proceeding? Errors, and even great errors, may creep into a true narration. This is a case where the tale had, according to all appearances, been carried orally for ages, perhaps for very many ages, before the race that have transmitted it to us had the means of giving it a written form. Was it not likely that much variation of particulars would creep in? Could they be shut out except by miracle, and has the Christian Church ever taught us to believe in such a miracle? Is it not the fact that the essence of the story remains in absolute integrity? A divine warning, a woful prevalence of sin, a terrible inundation or deluge as a punishment, the rescue of a small and righteous remnant; not only do these things remain, but traditions supporting them in several or in all points have descended to us independently through a hundred channels; and we are now asked to believe that, in each of these, imagination, and imagination only, has been at work, and that in each of them it has worked with an essentially identical result. May not this be to substitute for a great physical a greater moral miracle, and are we not even in some danger of exchanging the unaccountable for the absurd?

My conclusion, then, upon this part of the subject, be it worth much or little, is three-

fold. I am grateful to science, both physical and historical, for the great services it has rendered to the belief by the establishment of truths, or the rational acceptance of propositions, in its own domain. I feel that science is not responsible for any errors of scientists, either in the misconstruction of the Bible, or in offences which their share of human frailty may have led them occasionally to commit against the known laws of rational discussion. And, lastly, I am grateful both to science and to scientists for having assisted, or for having compelled, those who believe to correct errors which, in the wantonness of power, they may too long have cherished, and to submit all their claims to free and critical investigation.

The retreat from an untenable to a tenable position is in itself an unmixed good. But, given all the conditions of human feeling, thought, and action, it is an operation of invariable danger, and of mixed result. Happy they who accurately know, and who exactly realize to themselves, in the practical part of their being, what it is that they ought to abandon and what to retain, nor only to retain, but to uphold with a determination enhanced in proportion to the difficulties of the day. But in the minds of many, perhaps of the greater part, the dominant sense, at least for a time, will be that they have passed from a ground old and familiar to one new and strange; that they have parted with something, they do not quite know how much; that if they have been wrong once, they may, perhaps, be wrong again. And then it is so much easier to believe in a volume, which the hand could grasp, than to hold fast the mental conception of a Revelation conveyed in that volume. True, such a conception of God in the Bible, which may be, but ought not to have been, a new one, is strictly and solidly analogous to the familiar, and equally indispensable, conceptions of God in Nature, God in Providence, God in the Christian Church. But these we had from our cradles; they were thoroughly congenial through use. To apply the same rule to the Bible is really to integrate, rather than to disintegrate, the idea of our knowledge of God. But there is something like the discomfort of a new habiliment to be got over, and there are the taunts of the adversary to be endured.

I will not dwell at large upon other difficulties springing from the errors or the in-caution of believers; but they are grave in their nature. Whenever, under the idea of magnifying the grace or favor of God, we derogate from his immutable righteousness

and justice; and whenever, in exalting the unspeakable mercy of his pardon, we unhinge its inseparable alliance with a profound and penetrating moral work in the creature pardoned: then we draw down dangers upon the Christian system greater far than can ever be entailed upon it by its enemies.

But there may be worse still than this. Worse there will be, if the believer in Christ holds the doctrines without giving effect to it in his life; and worst of all if, while he holds it, he not only is betrayed into the ordinary weaknesses or excesses of human nature, but forgets also, and derides or disregards those primal sanctions of natural morality, which vice itself is not always hardened enough to discard. The constitution of the family, the ties between its members, the nature of the woman and of the man, the relation between them, and the relation of each of them to himself, to that God-given SELF, which is intrusted to every one of us to study and to revere, as well as to cleanse, to cherish, and to sanctify; these are regulated by laws the oldest, holiest, and most profound of all. Progress may be traced by its regard for them, which will decide whether it be a reality or an imposture; and Christianity itself would lose all its titles were it capable of an attempt to disturb them.

In the class of difficulties thus roughly suggested has been, as I believe, not, indeed, a legitimate, but a powerfully operative, cause for the increase of scepticism.

But the worst remains to be told. Negation is in part, and it professes and believes itself to be altogether an affair of the intellect. It proclaims, for example, that the reason why unbelief has (at the moment) so much advanced, is that dogmas like those of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the future Judgment, have become insufferable to the cultivated human understanding. The conviction which possesses my mind, and which I may find it difficult to express in an unexceptionable manner, is that the main operative cause which has stimulated the growth of negation is not intellectual, but moral; and is to be found in the increased and increasing dominion of the things seen over the things unseen.

Such a proposition may at first sight appear to carry an odious meaning, Pharisaical in the worst sense of the word; a meaning which would provoke, and might justify, an angry reply. It might be interpreted as implying that the elevation of moral character in individuals varied with and according to the amount of their dogmatic belief; a propo-

sition which in my view is untrue, offensive, and even absurd. Had I ever been inclined to such a conception, the experience of my life would long ago have undeceived me. My meaning is a very different one. I speak of that which touches not this or that man only, but us all. We have altered the standard of wants; we have multiplied the demands of appetite; we have established a new social tradition—one of those traditions which forms and guides us, apart from and antecedently to thought or choice of our own; we have created a new atmosphere, which we breathe into ourselves, and by breathing which our composition is modified unawares, according to the ingredients which that atmosphere contains. I do not say that we are the creatures of our environment, for we have power to reflect upon and to control it. But reflection and control are exercised but little in comparison with the need for them; and, in the absence of such exercise, it is the surrounding atmosphere, it is the accepted and ordinary standard, that both supplies the stock wherewith we individually begin the great adventure of the world, and that guides our life, except in the rare cases where depravity on one side, or Christian heroism on the other, causes us to adopt a separate standard for ourselves. Where both range only within the zone marked out by fashionable opinion, it is sadly easy to point out men of high virtue with little creed, and men of low virtue with much creed, in the discipline and conduct of their personal lives respectively. And, in the region of opinion, it often seems as if liberty and justice among men fared quite as well with the heterodox as with the orthodox.

A large part of these grave and even terrible anomalies is no doubt due to the fact that to each of us personally our creed has come, not with the throes of struggle, sacrifice, and strong conviction, but rather with all we hold—an easy tenure!—by descent, through others, not from ourselves; as matter of course, not of choice and effort; so that it marks us like an outward badge, rather than pervades us as a principle and a power.

But, on the other hand, how true it will be found that the sovereign tradition which has filled the air is the Christian tradition. This it is which has made possible what without it would have been wholly beyond reach. This it is which carries noiselessly into many minds and characters those opinions on behalf of virtue, of self-denial and of philanthropy, and the power of acting upon them, which are often found so hon-

orably to distinguish creedless men. Just as many, who do not reject Christianity, know not why? or how they came to hold it, so many, who have abjured Christianity, know not that in the best of their thought, their nature, and their practice, they are appropriating its fruits. What is the modern word "altruism"? As to its meaning, it is simply the second great commandment of the Christian law, which was "like unto the first." As to its form, it is merely a disguise which has been put upon a borrowed idea, so that it fails to be traced to its true original. And this not by a conscious, but, if the phrase may be pardoned, by an unconscious fraud. We find ourselves in possession of the code of Christian ethics, which has gradually pervaded life, institutions, manners, and has become so blended with our ordinary life that the memory of its divine origin has faded away, as though it were like the title-deed of an inheritance which we hold by unquestioned use. If we wish to know what the Christian tradition has done for us, we must examine the moral standard of nations who differed from us mainly in not having it. For example, we must look to the Greeks of the fifth century before Christ, or the Romans at the period of the Advent, whose moral degradation was not less conspicuous than the intellectual splendor of the one, or the constructive political genius of the other.

My twofold proposition is that we see before us an increased power of things seen, and that this increased power implies a diminishing hold upon us of things unseen. Throughout the history of mankind, the invisible, and the future which is part of the invisible, have been in standing competition with what may be termed the things of this world. There has never been a time in human history to compare with the last half-century in two vital respects: the multiplication of wealth, and the multiplication of the enjoyments which wealth procures. To take a familiar example: men (and the commodities they depend on) now travel at (say) one-fourth of the former cost, just when they have an enlargement of their means to bear the cost of travelling. True, this change has gone, to an immense extent, toward the cure of actual want, and toward extending the sphere of that sufficiency, that modest and humble comfort, which do not come within the scope of the present argument. But it has also extended largely to the spheres of leisure and of comparative affluence; and in those spheres it is generally true that the apparatus of enjoyment has been immensely developed in small things

and great, that wants and appetites have grown along with it, and that if "the world was too much with us" when Wordsworth wrote his noble sonnet, it is more with us now than it was then. Obviously, almost mathematically, the increased powers of worldly attraction disturb the balance of our condition, unless and until they are compensated by increased powers of unworldly attraction and elevation. Whence are such compensating powers to be had? I am afraid we can hardly say that, in the spheres now under view there has been such a growth, in unworldly motives and ideas, as to countervail the augmented strength of worldly attachment. And I apprehend that, if the unseen world and the ideas belonging to it operate upon us with a proportionately diminished force, it follows, almost as a matter of course, that creeds, which belong to that circle of unseen associations, will be more dimly and therefore more feebly appreciated.

Materialism as a formulated system is probably not upon the increase. Those who think as I am compelled to think about the intellectual calibre of such a system, will hardly include such a growth among the objects of their apprehension. But the power of a silent, unavowed, unconscious materialism is a very different matter. I think Professor Max Müller has said that without language there cannot be thought. And this I suppose is true of all organized and conscious thought. But there are in human nature a multitude of undeveloped (so to speak) embryonic forces, of impressions received from without and finding a congenial soil within, which never make their way to maturity, or obtain a defined place in our consciousness. My belief is that at this moment these unspoken and untested, not thoughts, but rudiments of thought, are at work among us and within us, and that were they translated or expanded into words their sense would be no more nor less than the old vulgar sense of those who in all ages have held that after all this world is the only world we securely know, and that the only labor that is worth laboring, the only care worth caring, the only joy worth enjoying, are the labor, the care, the joy, that begin and end with it.

What can be more natural (in the lower sense of nature) than that among those on whom this world really smiles, together with the increasing gravitation toward a terrestrial centre, a creeping palsy should silently come over the inward life? And how easy it is to understand that, when such a palsy has set in, a new and less ungenial color is

imparted to whatever undermines the written Word, or the great Christian tradition, or in whatever other way repels, or blinds and deadens, the sense of the presence of God, and the reproaches of the voice within. So that it is not either real or pretended science, nor is it even the errors and excesses of believers, illegitimately charged upon belief, that form the root of the mischief. It is the increased force within us of all which is sensuous and worldly that furnishes every sceptical argument, good, bad, or indifferent, with an unseen ally, and that recruits many a disciple of the negative teaching. He indeed dreams that by the free admission of doubt he is paying homage to truth, when in reality he is only pampering the inferior life, by allowing fresh coadjutors, with unexamined credentials, to enter and to reinforce its already overweening power. A latent conspiracy is established, and two knights ride forth together to the war, one of them fairly exhibiting his countenance, but the other with his visor on.

And the chain of cause and consequence is something like this. The Christian Creed generates a Christian tradition of idea and conduct. Of this tradition men do not disown the precepts; they only deny the parentage. And then there appears some great thinker, some really venerable man, who has learned to cherish piety while he discards dogma. The next order of operators in the field carry the work a stage farther, and cherish morality while they discard piety. And the anti-moral, anti-spiritual force, that is strong even if it be hidden in us all, using what is substantive in the work as a cover for what is destructive, looks on with complacency and swells the chorus of applause. The sceptical argument is in reality little more than a graft, set into and deriving its life and energy mainly from a tree stronger and more enduring than itself.

I must, however, in drawing these observations to a close, for a moment change my tone. In their nature apologetic, they themselves require an apology; and an apology, too, which is also in the nature of protest. They are intended to meet, so far as they go, a state of things peculiar and perhaps without example, in which multitudes of men call into question the foundations of our religion and the prerogatives of our sacred books, without any reference to either their capacity or their opportunities for so grave an undertaking. In other matters qualification must be known or shown; in religion it is taken for granted.

We have to bring equally into view, on

the one side and on the other, two great propositions. On the one hand, our religion stands on the foundation of free and intelligent assent. On the other hand, every man, whatever be his position, founds, and reasonably, nay, necessarily, founds the actions and experiences of his life principally upon trust. Upon trust, no doubt, which is both intelligent and free: but still upon *trust*. Upon trust, sometimes in particular individuals, sometimes upon traditions which are in a narrower or wider sphere the traditions of his race. Every one acting a responsible part in the world, be it great or small, and be it acted with or without consciousness of its character, is continually working for others as well as for himself; is establishing and verifying on behalf of others, and in lieu of others, intellectual conclusions or material facts, which are needful for human life, but which the conditions of human life do not permit men in each case to establish and verify for themselves. Still, to establish and verify for ourselves is best. Independent knowledge is to be preferred where, and as, it can be had. The limiting law is found in capacity and in opportunity. Let us examine, where we can: where we cannot, let us refuse to seek refuge in the falsehood of a pretended examination.

But it seems to be beyond doubt that, more perhaps in these days than of old, numbers both of women and of men question the religion delivered to them from of old without or in excess of both capacity and opportunity. The turn and training of the mind, the nature of callings and pursuits, make it for some of us reasonable and necessary to put the great historic revelation on its trial, as to its evidences of fact and doctrine, and its relation to the character and condition of man. This searching process is thoroughly normal, and its application to the subject-matter, and the commonly affirmative results of its application through so many ages, have continually added force to the authority with which the Gospel lays claim to our assent and our obedience.

As to the mass of mankind, however, reason teaches that the presumption is for each man in favor of that which he has received, until he has found solid cause to question it. It is doubt, and not belief, of the things received, which ought in all cases to be put upon its defence, and to show its credentials: credentials not necessarily in terms of demonstration, but of rational likelihood. But untested doubt, which often

makes a lodgment in our minds, is a dangerous and in the main an unlawful guest. It assumes unawares, and in default of examination, the attitude of demonstrated negation. It paralyzes action; it casts into the shade the sense of duty, and of the Divine presence encompassing us in all our ways; and it reduces the pulse of our moral health. Doubt may emancipate us. It may enslave us. But it must be either a friend or an enemy: it cannot be a neutral. And those doubts, which cannot be tested, ought not to be entertained as having a title to affect conduct or belief. And such inquiries as, from being inadequate, are illusory, are but fresh forms of temptation from the path of duty. Inquiry should be undertaken when it can be made the subject of effective prosecution. But if we have not the means of effective prosecution, the so-called inquiry is a pretence and an imposture; and, under its name, we become the mere victims of assumptions due to prejudice, to fashion, to propensity, to appetite, to the insidious pressure of the world-power, to temptation in every one of its Protean shapes. The universal call of man is for each to regulate his own proper conduct in his own proper sphere. A noble task for all, but an arduous task; a task so arduous that none can perform it in perfection. Duty does not require us to arrive at conclusions on

"Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,"

much less on the yet deeper and darker speculations which lie beyond, and which, so far as they are formidable, all run up into one single, one perhaps impenetrable problem, the presence and action of evil in the world. The Christian faith and the Holy Scriptures arm us with the means of neutralizing and repelling the assaults of evil in and from ourselves. That is a practical answer. Mist may rest upon the surrounding landscape, but our own path is visible from hour to hour, from day to day.

"I do not ask to see

The distant scene; one step enough for me."

Speculation, which is purposeless, becomes irreverent; and irreverent speculation on the doings and designs of God, by those who believe in him, is itself a sin. To leave the duty of governing conduct, to which every one of us is called, for other functions to which we are not called, unless the power of following them effectually proves our vocation for the work, is morally to pass from food to famine. It is as if one who possesses a piece or two of crockery full of

cracks, should announce that he desires to give a sumptuous banquet to the neighborhood.

But besides acknowledging that the proper preconditions of legitimate inquiry are adequate capacity and adequate opportunity, and deploring the course of those who treat naked and unreasoned doubt as casting a burden of proof upon belief, we must bear in mind that religious inquiry, though it may raise conflicting issues, is not like a suit between parties who meet upon equal terms, or the conflict of emperors warring for a territory in dispute. Our Saviour astonished the people because, instead of being lost in the mazes of arbitrary and vicious excrescences that darkened the face of religion, he taught them "with authority, and not as the scribes." Taught them with authority, that is to say, with the title to command, and with the force of command. If God has given us a revelation of his will, whether in the laws of our nature, or in a kingdom of grace, that revelation not only illuminates, but binds. Like the credentials of an earthly ambassador, it is just and necessary that the credentials of that revelation should be tested. But if it be found genuine, if we have proofs of its being genuine equal to those of which in the ordinary concerns of life reason acknowledges the obligatory character, then we find ourselves to be not independent beings engaged in an optional inquiry, but the servants of a Master, the pupils of a Teacher, the children of a Father, and each of us already bound with the bonds which those relations imply; then head and knee must bow before the Eternal, and the Divine will must be embraced and followed by man with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength.

I have yet more one closing word. I have desired to make this humble offering at the shrine of Christian belief in general, and have sought wholly to avoid the questions which concern this or that particular form of it. For there is a common cause, which warrants and requires common efforts. Far be from me the intention hereby to undervalue particular beliefs. I have not intentionally said a word to disparage them. It will in my view be an evil day, and a day of calamity, when men are tempted, even by the vision of a holy object, to abate, in any region or in the smallest fraction, the authority of conscience, or to forget that the supreme title and the supreme efficacy of truth lie in its integrity.

London, England.

THE MINISTRY REQUIRED BY THE AGE.*

BY R. W. DALE, LL.D.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, November 13, 1890.

II.

BUT I suppose that when I was asked to speak of the ministry required by the present age, it was intended that I should say something of the way in which the ministry should be affected by the present condition of the Church itself—its intellectual, ethical, and spiritual condition. An impossible subject! I approach it with despair; but I say again I must do what I can.

THEOLOGICAL TRANSITION.

(1) First of all, I think that you should wish your minister to recognize very frankly that immense intellectual movement in which all the Churches of the West have been involved since the Renaissance of the fifteenth century and the Reformation of the sixteenth. It has affected the theology of the Church of Rome as well as of the Protestant Churches. In the Protestant Churches there came a very powerful reaction, in the course of two or three generations after the great revolt against the Roman authority; but very soon the tide turned again, and it has been flowing—with some checks—ever since. The Protestant attempt to recast theological thought in scholastic forms has broken down. It had broken down before your time and mine. The Evangelical Revival of the last century was one of the forces which contributed to break it down. Forty—thirty years ago, perhaps later—there were men among us who exhorted us to be faithful to the theology of the Puritans, and by the Puritans they meant the Calvinistic Puritans; but these very men, though they were hardly conscious of it, had travelled very far from the position of the Puritan theologians. For good or for evil—partly, as I think, for both—they had ceased to hold the Puritan faith. Compare the Declaration of Faith and Order which was accepted by the ministers and representatives of the Congregational Churches of England and Wales in 1833—nearly sixty years ago—with the Westminster Confession; or compare it with the Declaration agreed upon by the elders and messengers of the Congregational

Churches in England who met at the Savoy just after the death of Cromwell, which was substantially identical with the Westminster Confession, and you will see how immense was the transition from the theology of the Puritans to the theology of our immediate ecclesiastical ancestors. The elaborate and stately system of theological belief which had been created by the theologians of the Reformed Church, of whom Francis Turretin is the best representative, has been sinking into decay for two centuries. And, as yet, no other organized theological system has taken its place.

That seems to me a great evil. For it shows that we have no intellectual expression of the contents of faith which satisfies us, or which even approximately satisfies us. There are many who regard this condition of things with exultation. They triumph in their freedom. They seem to imagine that they are displaying heroic courage in insulting and trampling under foot traditional creeds. There is no heroic courage in that. I see the ruins of a fortress, stern and mighty in other centuries, but tenantless for generations; it shows the traces of successful siege; it has been wasted by wind and rain and frost, and long neglect; the strong men, with nerves and muscles, as well as armor, of iron, who once held it against hostile armies, have long since turned to dust; the roof has fallen in; the walls are rent; many of its stones have been carried off by the neighbors to build, not another fortress, but very humble homes to shelter them from the weather. The men who assaulted it in its strength must have had courage; the people who are mocking at the ancient garrison and are dancing triumphantly in the grass-covered courtyard, require none.

Indeed the mocking and the dancing are rather frivolous occupations. Would it not be well, instead of dwelling very much more on the decay of old forms of theological belief, to attempt to construct new? While the intellect has no part, or very little part, in the religious life, the religious life will never have in it the elements of enduring vigour. The work of reconstruction must, I think, be done piece by piece. We may be satisfied if in a generation we make one or two great doctrines clearer and are able to define them with more precision. Our methods may as yet be imperfect; but we shall not be wise to wait till they are perfected; by putting them into practice we shall discover their defects and shall gradually amend them.

A strong intellectual conception of the

* The first part was reprinted in the December number of this MAGAZINE, pp. 200-204.

great truths of the Christian faith is a real aid to the moral and religious life. Where thought is vague, character is likely to be feeble. And do not be misled by the popular cry against the tyranny of exact theological thinking. Our present doctrinal controversies are, for the most part, not about the definitions of transcendent truths, but about the transcendent truths themselves. Definitions may be necessary in order to make the real issue clear. Athanasius defined because the Arians shuffled.

You should, in my judgment, wish your minister's preaching to be instructive. You should wish him to teach you something—something clear and definite—something that may not, indeed, be a final statement of the truth, for no statement of the truth can be final—but something which shall be sufficiently near the eternal fact for which it stands to serve you and to last your time.

The old maps of the country may be more or less inaccurate; they may have become untrustworthy; but this is generally acknowledged, and nothing is to be gained by further attacks on them; give us another map that shall more truly represent the outlines of the coast, the lay of the mountains, the course of the rivers; if you can only give us a fairly accurate map of a single district, that will be more to the purpose now than your demonstration of the untrustworthiness of the old maps of the continent. It is always easy to interest large numbers of people in attacks upon the beliefs of other people; try to create in this congregation a general and earnest desire to learn what you should believe yourselves. To people who have never had, or who have lost, the faculty for clear thinking, and to people who will not take the trouble to think, an instructive preacher will sometimes be dull; let your minister know that you like him to be dull in that way—at least now and then. Encourage him to respect the rights of the intellect; do not ask him always to preach sermons which can be understood by everybody, and understood without effort. As long as men are unwilling to serve God with their understanding, they withhold from Him half His claims.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

You will probably expect your minister to discuss, now and then, the questions which have been raised concerning the dates and authorship of the books of Holy Scripture. In a congregation like this it is hardly possible for him to pass them over. As far as the books of the New Testament are concerned, I think that we are within sight of

the practical close of the controversy. After a century of struggle the historical trustworthiness of the Four Gospels and the genuineness of, at least, all the important epistles are secure. But with regard to the earlier books of the Old Testament—their sources and the times at which they received their present form—the battle is at its height. He would be a rash man, I think, who ventured just now to speak with absolute confidence on some of the questions under debate. Do not be alarmed if you find that your minister is uncertain about them—if he speaks with hesitation, if he declines to commit himself to a definite judgment. I cannot doubt that the issue of this controversy will, in any case, be to enlarge and exalt our conceptions of the method of divine revelation; but the good which is certain to come of it will be immensely increased if, while it lasts, you and all other churches wait patiently for its final results, and see clearly that no uncertainties with regard to investigations of this kind should lessen the strength or diminish the joy of your own consciousness that in Christ you have been restored to God.

(2) But it is certain that while our doctrinal uncertainties last, and while the debate on the literary and historical questions relating to our sacred books is still going on, there is serious peril to the spiritual life. I will not at this moment attempt to determine whether the peril is greater than that which has to be reckoned with when the Church is disturbed by no serious intellectual conflicts. It is enough for us to consider our own dangers.

There are large numbers of people in our churches whose chief intellectual interests—I mean their chief intellectual interests in religion—lie remote from the central truths of the Christian Gospel. They are deeply concerned, for example, in questions about the future of those who in this world are impenitent—a question, no doubt, of immense importance, but one on which they will never reach a right conclusion, except by accident, as long as they have no corresponding intellectual interest in *all* the main truths which are implicated in the Incarnation of Christ and His death for the sins of the world. Others, again, are chiefly interested in literary, historical, or scientific questions relating to the Old Testament; these, too, are questions important in their place. But this diversion of intellectual and even moral interest from the central facts of the revelation of God in Christ—this absorption in a special set of questions, some of which are purely speculative and are re-

more
and
ister.

You
on th
think
those
very
speak
God's
your
him
as a
of th
to co
of ou
sibili
with
actu
hum
His
hard
Aton
the g
suffe
for i
thro
"un
your
grace
by fa
the l
men
cent
more
You
that
who
more
be a
your
the
ever

THE

(3)
ethi
our
trea
have
not
our
hom
free
with
a go
"T
—th
evit
mist

mote from life and practice—is a grave evil, and must be taken into account by the minister.

You should wish him to speak, not merely on those subjects upon which you are always thinking and reading and talking, but on those great things about which you think very little; and you should wish him to speak of them in a manner that will, through God's grace, give them their right place in your thought and life. You should wish him to speak of these forgotten truths, not as a theologian, but as a minister of Christ; of the Incarnation, not so as to enable you to construct a theory about the limitations of our Lord's knowledge or His real accessibility to temptation, but so as to fill you with awe and wonder in the presence of the actual assumption of human nature and human life by the Eternal Son of God; of His sufferings and death, not so as to resolve hard questions about the theory of the Atonement, but so as to bring home to you the greatness of the redemption which His sufferings and death achieved for mankind; for in Christ "we have our redemption through the blood," and His blood was shed "unto remission of sins." You should wish your minister to make real to you, by God's grace, Paul's exultation in being "justified by faith"—the boundless joy, the new vigour, the large freedom which came to Christian men when that great truth, covered for centuries with thick clouds, shone out once more in its old splendour at the Reformation. You should wish him so to speak of Christ that you may know for yourselves that He who died is alive again and liveth forevermore; of the Spirit of God, that you may be able to bear witness, on the strength of your own experience, that He has come to the Church, and that He abides with it forever.

THE LOSS OF THE TRADITIONAL METHOD OF LIFE.

(3) Finally, there is a great deal in the ethical and religious life of the churches of our times which requires special and serious treatment by the Christian ministry. We have escaped from the power of tradition, not only in our theological thought, but in our personal habits and in the order of our homes. This freedom, like the theological freedom, is also spoken of by many persons with exultation, as though it were altogether a good thing, and had no evil in it.

That the tradition of conduct was outworn—that its passing away was, therefore, inevitable—is no doubt true. But this is our misfortune; we have no reason for rejoic-

ing in it. It is an immense loss not to inherit by birth a method of life; for this means that the experience of past generations conveys no guidance to us as to the conduct and habits which contribute to form an ideal Christian character. It means that we have to begin afresh and to learn everything for ourselves. It is like being born into a country in which there are no roads, and in which we have to discover by exploration how to get from one point to another. Even after the exploration the roads have to be made, if we are to travel safely and easily. Human life is so complex that in the absence of definite traditions how it should be ordered, we are sure to make the gravest mistakes, and in the individual life the mistakes can never be remedied. If parents, for example, inherit no tradition as to the best way of ordering the lives of their children, they are sure—even the wisest of them—to go wrong, and to go wrong on some very important points; and the injury which their children suffer is permanent: it cannot be undone. If young men and women form habits which experience shows them to be injurious—and they are likely to form such habits ignorantly unless a wise tradition of conduct has great moral authority over the people with whom they live—the habits, even if at last they are broken, have permanently affected the power and grace of character.

We had a traditional method of life at one time; indeed, we had it within the memory of many people now living; but it has disappeared; and now every man does what is right in his own eyes. We have the Sermon on the Mount; but the application of the Sermon on the Mount to the details of conduct is difficult. The old method had become hard, mechanical, artificial; but still it was a method, and it contained—though in a half-fossilized form—the results of the experience of several generations of devout Christian men and women.

For example, the traditional method of life gave us a certain conception of Sunday, and of how Sunday should be kept; how often we should attend public worship; what kind of books we should read at home; what occupations were lawful on Sunday, what were unlawful, to a Christian man. The old method has gone. Every man has now to find out for himself how it is best to keep Sunday; at present I do not think that the general results of the experiment can be regarded with satisfaction.

Take another example: Within the memory of many of us, works of fiction were peremptorily excluded from the homes of large

numbers of Congregationalists. To read a novel was a mark of unregeneracy. I remember very well preaching a sermon in which I incidentally defended novel reading; it was in the early days of my ministry, and it greatly troubled some of the older members of my congregation—venerable, saintly men and women, whom I *often* troubled, but who showed great generosity and magnanimity in their treatment of me. Now, young and old, we are all reading novels. But at a church meeting at Carrs Lane, held a fortnight or three weeks ago for conference on the hindrances to Christian living, I read a letter from one of the members—for we allow those to write who shrink from speaking—in which the writer said that for nineteen years her passion for works of fiction had been one of her greatest hindrances; that she had fought hard with it, but was not even now sure that it was finally mastered. And there can be no doubt that excessive novel reading has an effect upon the moral and religious life analogous to that of excessive drinking; it weakens moral fibre, makes the will irresolute, destroys self-restraint, renders impossible many of the nobler virtues.

Take another example: The old method of life forbade a large number of amusements which we regard as innocent; and we scoff at its irrational rigidity. But at another church conference held a week later than that to which I have just referred, we had a conversation on the interest of the Church in Missions; and in a letter from another member of the church, it was said that thirty years ago our young people were very generally interested in Foreign Missions, but that now large numbers of them are so occupied with lawn-tennis and other out-door amusements in summer, and with pursuits of other kinds in winter, that they have neither the time nor the disposition to read about Missions or to care for them.

The old method of life, I repeat, cannot be defended. It declared many things to be wrong in themselves which are right in themselves. It was technical, external. It reminds me of the rabbinical interpretations of the Fourth Commandment. It is a sin, the rabbis argued, to work on the Sabbath; to lift and to carry a heavy burden—a burden weighing a hundred-weight, to use modern terms—is to work, and therefore is a sin; but to lift and to carry a burden weighing ten pounds less than a hundred-weight is also a sin, for a few pounds in the weight of a burden cannot make any difference in the morality of carrying it; and to lift and to carry a still lighter burden is also a sin; and

at last they concluded that it was a sin to pick up and carry a piece of string. And some of the severer interpreters of the law maintained that since all work is muscular exertion, there should be no muscular exertion of any kind on the Sabbath—a case of “undistributed middle”—and that to keep the commandment perfectly a man should remain absolutely motionless through the whole of its twenty-four hours. The method of life which was once authoritative among us had this technical rabbinical character. You ought not to make a shirt on Sunday; therefore, you ought not to sew on a button.

And yet there was more of philosophy than we sometimes suppose in those rigid rules, which absolutely forbade any common work on the Sunday, and the writing of letters, and the reading of newspapers and “secular” books; declared all novels contraband; and condemned all exciting amusements. Things which are innocent, perhaps helpful, in moderation, are ruin and death in excess. The old method of life rested upon the same principle that is the reasonable ground of the Total Abstinence movement in our own times; to large numbers of persons total abstinence is easy—total abstinence from beer and spirits and wine—from billiards, from dancing, from novels, from occupations on Sunday which are not strictly religious—but moderation is difficult. Our fathers insisted on total abstinence.

Apart from these definite and rigid rules, the whole conception of life which was traditional among us till within recent years was different from our own. Our strength has always been largely derived from the merchants, manufacturers, and prosperous tradesmen in the great towns and cities of the kingdom; and I think that, as a rule, in the early part of this century a merchant, a manufacturer, or a tradesman, who was a member of a Congregational Church, was quite satisfied to live in a smaller house than a merchant, manufacturer, or tradesman with the same income, who was what he would call “a man of the world;” he had less “glass” in his grounds; he kept fewer servants and fewer horses and carriages; he gave less costly entertainments. His whole way of living was simpler. There was a larger margin between his income and expenditure. There was a certain restraint upon indulgence in the pleasant things which were within his reach. All this came from a traditional theory—not perhaps very exactly defined—of the difference between the Christian and the worldly life. The

theor
the p
has a
are c
might
the c

In
prun
imag
tion
sculp
the m
begin
and

corru
to a
so in
tion.
and
and
silke
gird
has
away
pear
ask
stru
than
need

T
this
Chr
in t
Par
hom
the
emp
out
mal

T
and
Spi
of
com
scie
He
all,
rec
selv
tha
nev
int
hou
we
—
tim
dor
ha

mi
qu

theory has disappeared, and with the theory the practice. The very word "worldly" has almost ceased to be used. "Old times are changed; old manners gone;" and it might be worth while to consider whether the change is altogether for the better.

In literature a certain self-restraint, a pruning of a too luxurious growth of imagery and style, is necessary to perfection; in every form of art—in painting, sculpture, architecture—the decline from the nobleness and grace of the great masters begins with the relaxation of this restraint; and a similar relaxation is followed by the corruption of eloquence and its degradation to a worthless and pernicious rhetoric. And so in the conduct of life a certain moderation, a voluntary limitation of expenditure and enjoyment, is the condition of power and grace and dignity. Under even the silken robe there should be the leathern girdle. It is not the "body" merely which has to be kept under if we are not to be cast-aways. The old method of life has disappeared. Is it not time for congregations to ask their ministers to assist them in constructing a new method, wiser and better than the old? for a new method is urgently needed.

The Christian ideal of life and conduct in this present century—what is it? The Christian ideal on the exchange, in the mill, in the workshop, in the counting-house, in Parliament, in the City Council, in the home—what is it? The Christian ideal for the employer, the Christian ideal for the employed—what is it? The old ways are out of repair, going to ruin; it is time to make straight paths for our feet.

To construct the Christian ideal of life and conduct we must be filled with the Spirit of God, must live under the full power of that transcendent revelation which has come to us through Christ, and in the conscious possession of that redemption which He achieved for the human race, once for all, by His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection. We must see and know for ourselves that He has made all things new; that we are living in a new earth and under new heavens. Eternal things must enter into the solution of the problems of the hour. In determining how we are to live we must remember, first of all, what we are—children of God redeemed by Christ, destined to an endless life of righteousness, wisdom, blessedness, and glory, and that we have to make our calling and election sure.

And so in this age, as in all past ages, the ministry which the Church supremely requires is a ministry filled with awe and

strength and tenderness by the immediate vision of God in Christ. And this is the ministry which is also supremely required by the world. If we know God in Christ for ourselves, men will listen to us with confidence when we tell them that they too may have redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveness of sins, and that through Him they may share the life and the joy of God.

IS THERE A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

BY HENRY CHARLES LEA.

From *The Independent*, New York, November 27, 1890.

(Continued from the December number.)

II.

THE validity of all sacraments, as we have seen in the previous article, depends not only on the good faith of the minister but also upon his mental condition during the ceremony, two wholly unknown and undiscoverable factors. When once this conclusion was reached there was opened a boundless field of speculation as to the infinite varieties of mental processes which still further complicated the already hopelessly tangled question. All theologians agreed that virtual intention suffices, but the definition of virtual intention was no easy matter in practice. Scotus, Suarez and Vasquez frame one definition, Coninch another, Lugo and Dicastillo another; all these are authorities of the first rank, and the shrewd Jesuit Viva, who reports them, wisely declines to decide between them.* Then the fact that the priest may have two intentions gives rise to many nice distinctions; the more powerful of the two is held to be the determining one; but if they are successive the later, unless the earlier had rendered void all subsequent ones; in any case, if there is doubt concerning them the validity of the sacrament is doubtful.† An explicit intention of making the sacrament is not essential, for if a man intends to do what the Church does this is sufficient, even if he does not believe in the sacrament; thus the heretic can baptize even if he laughs at the doctrine that baptism is a sacrament and does not wish to do what the Roman Church does; for he wishes to do what

* Viva, *Theologica Trutina*, *ubi sup.*

† Liguori, *Theol. Moral.*, Lib. VI, n. 24.

Christ commanded, and this prevails over his error in thinking his own Church the true one. But if the celebrant believes that an explicit intention is necessary and he has not such explicit intention, then he does not administer a valid sacrament.* These examples will suffice to show how dangerous was the question which involved such subtle metaphysical distinctions, and only became more complicated and doubtful the more it came to be elucidated.

There were a few theologians sufficiently alive to the uncertainty thus cast on all the ministrations of the Church to seek for some mitigation of the Tridentine canon. The learned Dominican, Ambrogio Caterino, was a member of the Council and vigorously opposed its decision, pointing out the desolation which a wicked or infidel priest might spread among the faithful by withholding his intention and thus rendering invalid the baptism of those who might afterward rise to high places in the Church, all of whose ordinations and other acts would be nugatory; it was no answer to say that such cases were rare, for in that corrupt age they were frequent. In spite of his protests the canon was adopted; but his sense of impending evils was so strong that he soon afterward, in 1552, wrote a tract "*De Intentione Ministri*," to prove that the only intention requisite was that of performing the external rite without reference to the internal mental operation.† Though Caterino was eventually promoted to the archbishopric of Conza, his argument reduced the Tridentine definition to so absurd a nullity that it found no favor and was speedily forgotten. In the next century, however, it was revived by Joseph Maria Scribonius, a Frenchman, who labored to show that it had not been condemned at Trent, and he was followed by several others, mostly of the same nationality, such as Salmeron, Contenson, Bossuet, Serry and Juenin.‡ At length the Holy See felt it necessary to put an end to these speculations, and in a list of errors condemned by Alexander VIII., December 7th, 1690, was the one of maintaining that baptism is valid, even if the ministrant declares internally that it is not his intention to do what the Church does. Under pain of *ipso-facto* excommunication, removable only by the Pope, even the discussion of this proposition was

forbidden, except to attack it.* Since this emphatic warning there has been little dissidence of opinion. The learned Benedict XIV., it is true, unofficially stated that there had been no express definition by the Holy See as to the manner in which God regards the question; but as the common opinion of the theologians requires actual or virtual intention, that opinion is always to be followed in practice, yet bishops ought not to condemn the other side.† The leading modern authorities, however, are unequivocal in their assertion of the necessity of intention. La Croix even holds that not only intention but attention is requisite, and that distraction on the part of the priest invalidates the sacrament, but he stands alone in this.‡

Yet one kindly exception has been made in deference to the needs of human society. As the social organization is built upon the family, and as matrimony is a sacrament, it would be too great a demand upon the obedience of the faithful to inflict upon all married persons the torturing doubt as to whether they are living in concubinage and whether their children are illegitimate, in consequence of the unknown and impene- trable mental condition of the minister officiating at their nuptials. The theologians, therefore, for the most part have mercifully discovered that in matrimony the real ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties themselves and not the priest. It is true that some great authorities, including Melchor Cano, deny this; but the mass of Catholic doctors, represented by the supreme name of Alphonso Liguori, decide in favor of the sacramental character of the action of the bride and groom, so that the uncertainty which hangs over the administration of all other sacraments need not cast a shadow over the households of the faithful.§ Yet, after all, this only transfers the doubt from the priest to the contracting parties, for their intention thus becomes necessary to the validity of the sacrament, and this gives rise to a further endless series of questions on which the authorities are by no means agreed. The common opinion is that intention is sufficiently to be inferred if the man expresses consent and the woman holds out her hand to him.¶ This, however, is far from settling the matter, for the con-

* Liguori, Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, 22, 25.

† Sarpi, Hist. del Conc. Trident., Lib. II (Ed. Helmstadt I, 234).—Bened. PP. XIV. De Synodo Dioc., Lib. VII, c. iv, n. 6.

‡ Viva, Theologica Trutina, ubi sup.—Benedict. PP. XIV. De Synodo Dioc., Lib. VII, c. iv, n. 6.—Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n. 23.—Addis and Arnold, Catholic Dictionary, s. v., Sacraments of the Gospel, § 5.

• Alex. PP. VIII, Constit. *Pro pastoralis cura*, Prop. 26 (Bullar. Rom. T., XII, p. 67).

† Bened., PP. XIV, De Synodo Dioc., Lib. VII, c. iv, n. 9.

‡ Ferraris, s. v., *Intentio*, n. 23.—Liguori, Lib. VI, n. 1, 13, 14. Sanchez, Prontuario de la Theologia Moral, Trat. I, Punto iv, § 2, 5, 6.

§ Melchor, Cane de Locis Theolog., Lib. VIII, c. 5.—S. Alph. Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n. 297. Sanchez, Prontuario, Trat. I, Punto iv, § 1, n. 2.

¶ Liguori, Lib. VI, n. 299.

sent may have been given under misapprehension or through deceit, rendering the contract a virtually conditional one in which the condition is not fulfilled, and there is thus no real intention. It would be useless to follow the theologians through their interminable debates as to the precise degree of error necessary to invalidate a marriage, or to review the nice distinctions drawn and the conflict of authorities which perplex the matter until the attempt to lay down rules for guidance only renders it more difficult of solution.* The practical import of all this was illustrated, about a fortnight since, in a Philadelphia tribunal, where there was an effort to break a marriage between a Catholic girl and a Jew. Father Dressmann brought his authorities into court and argued that the bride had been deceived as to the religion of the groom and therefore there had been no marriage. "It was not the intention," he said, "of Anna Eichert to be married to a Jew; it was not her intention to be married to the son of the old Steins; the mutual consent on her part was wanting."† If his facts were true he was perfectly correct, according to the doctrines of the theologians; but it would be a misfortune for society if every disillusioned husband and wife were to seek thus to prove the nullity of an ill-assorted marriage.

Having thus established the necessity of the intention of the ministrant to the validity of the sacraments, the Church must accept the results, even if they lead to its self-extinction. It would be difficult indeed to limit the consequences of the position to which it has been driven in its contests with the heretics. As the doctrine of intention is a matter of faith, it is part of the economy of the universe, and has existed from the beginning, not merely since the thirteenth century, when it was discovered, but since the period of the Apostles. There are, therefore, twelve centuries during which the ignorance of it must have led to innumerable baptisms and ordinations which were invalid and void. Even after its recognition no one cognizant of the weakness of human nature or familiar with the perpetually recurring denunciations of clerical corruption can doubt that, at least until recent times, the Church has been full of reckless, careless and perverse priests, whose ministrations have been void through

ignorance and indolence, if not through malice or infidelity, and of bishops whose worldliness rendered the performance of their office a mere perfunctory duty. Since the outbreak of the Reformation, moreover, there have been thousands of apostates, who before openly leaving the Church may have desired to harm it as much as possible. The effect of all this has been twofold. As regards the faithful themselves, it would be impossible to compute the millions who have been consigned to the eternal torments of Hell, either through failure to enjoy valid baptism, and thus to become Christians, or through failure to obtain valid absolution, on which they have relied for the pardon of their sins. This has not only resulted from lack of due intention on the part of the ministrants of the sacraments, but from the fact that there has been a steadily increasing number of ecclesiastics whose defective ordination has precluded them from administering any valid sacraments save baptism.

This latter is, perhaps, the most serious aspect of the doctrine, as it may vitiate the whole organization of the Church. Of the myriads whose baptism has been invalid great numbers have unquestionably entered the Church, although in reality incapacitated from ordination; and to these are to be added those whose ordination by careless bishops has been defective. Any of these who have reached the episcopal rank have been incapable of conferring valid ordination; and those to whom they have administered the sacrament of orders have not been really priests. Such a source of infection spreads incomputably; for every unbaptized or imperfectly ordained priest who becomes a bishop becomes also a new centre whence the impalpable and invisible virus extends on all sides. It is, therefore, uncertain to-day whether any priest is really a priest; and it is among the possibilities that from the Pope down there is not one who is actually in orders and in possession of the supernatural powers which he claims to exercise. Thus take the venerable Leo XIII. If in the interminable line of his spiritual ancestry there has been a single one whose ordination was thus vitiated, Leo is not really in orders, and all his acts are invalid. Or if this has happened to any former Pope, his creations of cardinals have been void, and subsequent Popes have been elected by a hopelessly unlawful body. No man can tell whether the whole organization of the Church may not be fatally "irregular," and whether there has been for centuries a real successor to St. Peter. It is, therefore, a fair subject for speculation

* Liguori, Lib. vi, n. 1012-23.

† In this case the learned judge refused to accept the Catholic view, and informed the bride: "By the law of God your marriage was not null and void. . . . By the law of the land you are irrevocably bound to him;" and on his instructing her that she was free to go with her husband, she joyfully did so.

whether by this time the Church has not extinguished itself.

There have not been wanting those who from time to time have called attention to some of these consequences of the dogma, and the attempts made to answer them show their arguments to be unanswerable. Hardly had the doctrine been formulated and established when its opponents pointed out that no one could tell whether a priest was really a priest. All that Durand de Saint Pourçain can advance in reply to this is to dismiss it as frivolous, because you cannot expect to have certainty in everything.* When Caterino urged the same argument fruitlessly on the Fathers of Trent, Cardinal Pallavicino makes a labored effort to refute him by pointing out that lack of intention is not the only danger which we incur in the sacraments, for a wicked priest can nullify them by omitting necessary words—thus admitting the danger and multiplying it—and that we must rely on Providence to guide the hearts of men or avert the evil in some unknown manner; besides, men cannot complain if they fail of salvation, for they are unworthy of it, and perhaps God may supply what is lacking in the act of the priest—all of which confesses that the only way to escape the consequences of the doctrine is to abandon it.† Willem van Est, one of the soundest and sanest theologians of the seventeenth century, satisfies himself with assuring the faithful that they must be content with what he assumes to be moral certainty and not trouble themselves about possibilities.‡ Ferraris meets the argument that it is contrary to the goodness of God that infants or contrite sinners should be damned through the malice of a priest by coolly remarking that they are damned for their sins, original or actual; there is no defect in God's goodness, who has provided the means of salvation, and he is not bound, even if he could, to impede the malice of the minister.§ All this shows that the Church admits the consequences of the position taken at Trent, but is unable to devise a remedy.

Yet I do not for a moment suppose that Leo XIII. entertains the slightest doubt as to the validity of his claim to act as the Viceregent of Christ, or that the faithful in general allow their equanimity to be disturbed as to the efficacy of the sacraments administered to them, save in the rare cases when a priest abandons the Church and his

recent penitents feel it incumbent on them to repeat their confessions and obtain absolution *ad cautelam*. Nevertheless, the subject is not without interest as an illustration of the imbecility of man when he attempts to control the infinite and arrogates to himself a portion of God's power without sharing God's omniscience.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I.

MODERN EXAGGERATIONS OF THE DIVINE IMMANENCE.

BY PRESIDENT AUGUSTUS H. STRONG, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, December 4 and 11, 1890.

EVERY great system of error has in it a grain of truth, and it is this truth, rather than the falsehood mingled with it, that gives the system its hold and power among men. This is what Frederick W. Robertson meant when he spoke of "the soul of good in things evil." The single good kernel is buried in a heap of chaff; but we must find and set aside the good before we can deprive the evil of its seeming weight and influence. It is the immeasurable distinction of Christianity and the proof of its divine origin that it not only contains all these grains of truth which give power to other systems, but presents them in clear and exalted forms without the slightest admixture of error.

EXCLUSIVE TRANSCENDENCE IS DEISM.

There are two great truths of Scripture and of theology which are essential to our conception of God: the truth of God's immanence, on the one hand, and the truth of God's transcendence on the other. They are mutually complementary hemispheres in our rounded globe of doctrine; like the pillars Jachin and Boaz, they are twin wardens of the sanctuary. But either one of them, taken by itself to the exclusion of the other, may become a great error. A half truth is a whole falsehood. The English deism of the seventeenth century was simply an exaggeration of the truth of the divine transcendence. It had influence even upon subsequent defenders of the faith. Christian apologists, such as Paley, conceived of God as a workman who lives outside of his work, like the watchmaker who makes the watch, but sells it to the owner; like the shipwright who launches the ship, but commits it to the sailors. Such doctrine wrought

* Durand. de S. Portiano Comment. super Sentent. Lib. IV. Dist. xix. Q. 2. § 7.

† Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident. IX. vj. 4-6.

‡ Estius in Lib. IV. Sentent. Dist. i. § 24.

§ Ferraris, Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Intentio*, n. 30.

incidental harm to theology and merited the scornful characterization of Carlyle: "An absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath at the outside of the universe and seeing it go."

Yet it would be wrong to say that the opposite truth of God's immanence has ever been lost out of the experience of the church. The presence of God in nature, the consciousness of which gives such a warmth and glow to the 104th Psalm, has its counterpart in the experience of every New Testament believer. The indwelling of a divine Redeemer in the heart has been a part of the Christian consciousness ever since Christianity began—in fact, "Christ in you, the hope of glory," is the very essence of the Christian religion. God's indwelling is a truth without which no true religion is possible; and Augustine, who has been accused of ignoring it, has left to the world no more famous saying than that in which he recognizes it: "O God, thou hast made us for thyself, and our heart is restless till it find rest in thee!"

EXCLUSIVE IMMANENCE IS PANTHEISM.

As deism is an exaggeration of the truth of divine transcendence, so pantheism is an exaggeration of the truth of divine immanence. Its plausibility and attraction consist in this, that it continually emphasizes and exclusively inculcates God's universal and perpetual abiding in the things and the beings he has made. The error of pantheism is that it holds to God's immanence alone, and makes this an exhaustive expression of the truth. The truth of God's immanence needs to be qualified by the truth of God's transcendence. And this the Scripture does. There we read of "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." There is the truth of pantheism—God is "through all and in you all." But then the apostle who writes these words shows the incalculable superiority of Christianity to pantheism, by putting in the forefront the truth of which pantheism never dreamed. Before he speaks of God as "through all, and in you all," he speaks of God as "above all." Now, we have a basis for immanence, in the transcendent existence of God. Before the world, and outside the world, God is, forevermore.

In the great pendulum-swing of human thought, this last truth of God's transcendence is now coming to be ignored. We live in a time of pantheistic tendencies, and all our literature is affected by them. As Paley was unconsciously influenced by the

very deism which he attacked, so many Christian thinkers of the present day are powerfully influenced by the pantheism with which they intend to be at war. They dwell upon God's immanence, to the exclusion of God's transcendence. They so merge him in the universe, that the personal and living God is in danger of being lost sight of. It will be of service to consider this exaggeration of the divine immanence, and to point out the perils to which it is exposed. In this first article, I propose to notice certain tenets by which it is characterized. In a second article, I shall attempt to furnish the antidote, by calling attention to facts which refute it.

CONTINUOUS CREATION VS. CREATION.

This method of thought substitutes, for creation, the idea of continuous creation. It denies that there ever was any real beginning of the universe. God has always been creating, and he is creating still. Creation is a continual necessity, because no single thing in the universe has any independent existence or power. The moon in the sky does not owe its existence at this moment to the fact that it existed a moment ago—God must at each successive instant create it over again. Even God cannot make anything that shall last a moment after he has created it.

Now it is true that science cannot tell us of beginnings—it only records changes. Geology, as has been well said, is the autobiography of the earth; no autobiography can tell the story of its author's birth; and geology cannot tell how the world first came into being. But what science cannot do, revelation does do; the problem before which science stands petrified, as by the stare of a Gorgon, Scripture solves: "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear." How significant it is that the very first word of the Bible is one that asserts, over against this false doctrine that God is only in the world, the great truth that God existed before the world, that creation is not a series of acts without beginning, that the entire universe had a beginning, that this beginning was due to God: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." How significant it is that the Sabbath day has been established as a perpetual monument to God's creative activity, so that Sabbath bells and Sabbath worship are ever recurring divine testimonies to God's transcendence, to the fact that he is above the world as well as in it, to the

fact that "heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him."

EVOLUTION VS. PROVIDENCE.

This method of thought substitutes, for God's providence, a merely natural evolution. It will not grant that there are any second causes in nature. All is the direct work of God, and God works only in lines of regular development.

Now we grant that there was a time when too much was ascribed to mere external fiat, and too little to natural growth. But this was not the fault of Scripture, it was the fault of man's short-sighted interpretations of Scripture. The Bible recognizes development: the earth brings forth, the tree yields fruit whose seed is in itself, and man is fruitful and multiplies. But the account in Genesis is not only prefaced by the originating act of God, it is supplemented by successive manifestations of creative power in the introduction of brute and of human life. Here, too, Scripture gives an answer to questions which science cannot solve. Along the line of development there are breaks which science cannot fill. How could the organic come from the inorganic, the vegetable from the stone or the clod? Science cannot tell us. How did the animal originate from the plant? Science is silent. Did man come from the brute? Science cannot prove it; the links are missing. Can Christ be explained as a natural evolution from the Pharisees and Sadducees? Was Paul, the apostle, only a natural outgrowth from Saul, the persecutor? Who does not see that these gaps in the line of development need to be filled in by new-creating activities of God; that they prove the existence of a God above nature, as well as in nature; that they witness to God's transcendence, as well as to his immanence?

NATURAL LAW VS. MIRACLES AND INSPIRATION.

This method of thought would substitute, for miracles and inspiration, a God who works only through natural law. We are asked whether the daily miracle of the sunrise and the sunset is not better than sporadic exhibitions of divine power. No, we reply, not if sin blinds men to the presence of God in these uniformities of nature. The dull heart needs special proofs of God's power and special communications of his love. To say that everything is miracle, is simply to say that nothing is miracle. To say that everybody is more or less inspired, is simply to say that nobody is inspired, and

that one book is no more authoritative than another.

Why do we have Christmas presents in Christian homes? Because the parents do not love their children at other times? No; but because the children's minds become sluggish in the presence of merely regular kindness, and special gifts wake them up to gratitude. Shall God alone be shut up to dull uniformity of action? Shall God alone be unable to make special communications of his love? Frances Power Cobbe says well: "It is a singular fact that, whenever we find out how a thing is done, our first conclusion seems to be that God did not do it." The more law the sinful soul sees, the less God it recognizes, and, therefore, God at times mercifully breaks through the chain of ordinary sequences, and shows that they do not exhaust his power. Miracle and inspiration prove that God is not entombed in nature, but that he is above nature, a transcendent as well as an immanent God.

DIVINE ACTIVITY VS. SIN.

This method of thought substitutes, for sin, a form of the divine activity. The tendency to identify all natural causes with God's working is also a tendency to identify the human will with God's working. To those who hold this view, there really is but one substance—man and nature alike are but modifications of the divine being. And, therefore, sin is the product of divine causality, the strange creation of the all-working God. Such a conclusion is, of course, so plainly immoral, and so destructive of our fundamental conceptions of God, that it needs to be spoken with bated breath and to be veiled in ambiguous phrase. Sin is called a metaphysical necessity, a mere negation, a dark background without which good could not appear in its true brightness.

But all this is the direct contradiction to conscience and to Scripture. These testify that sin is the abominable thing that God hates, that it is the product of the human will, not of the divine activity. Man is himself a creative first cause, and he has used his creative activity in the production of moral evil. Here we have the proof that monism is false. God and man are not of the same substance, else moral evil had been impossible. Every monistic system breaks in pieces when it attempts to deal with the fact of sin. The accusations of conscience and the threatenings of God are swift witnesses to disprove any exercise-theory or negation-theory which would transfer the blame of sin from man to his Maker, and

those who make the human soul the mere manifestation of an *anima mundi*, or world-soul, need well to ponder God's words: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness!"

HUMANITY VS. DEITY IN CHRIST.

This method of thought substitutes for deity in Jesus Christ, a mere humanity after the model of our own. The old way of denying Christ's deity was by making him to be only man. The new way of denial is much more subtle and ingenious; it simply says that we are all God. "Jesus Christ is the only God," said William Blake to Crabb Robinson, "and so am I, and so are you." Because God is in all men, all men are therefore God; and Jesus Christ is a being not different in kind from ourselves. So we find Hegel writing: "I can say with Christ, not only that I teach the truth, but that I am the truth." And in the *Paradise Lost*, John Milton represents even the prince of fallen angels as saying:

"the son of God I am, or was;
And if I was, I am: relation holds;
All men are sons of God."

Yet these utterances are only logical consequences of this exaggeration of the divine immanence of which I have been speaking. When the only God that exists is the God in us and in the universe, then the transition is easy to self-deification and the deification of nature.

But, as if in preparation for this modern doctrine that all men are sons of God in the same sense that Jesus is, the Scripture speaks of "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father," and of "the glory which he had with the Father before the world was." Christ is Son in a sense not predicable of the most exalted creature. He is Son by being of the same essence or substance with the Father, uncreated and eternal. The essence or substance of man's being is of a different sort—it once was not, and it now is only by the creative act of God. Christ saves us from idolatry of the creature by presenting in himself the true image of the Godhead, by showing us that there are heights of divine purity and power which our human nature cannot reach. Without belief in this transcendent God who manifests himself in Christ, the arch of Christian faith loses its keystone and falls. As the apostle John declares: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist,

whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

SUBJECTIVE VS. OBJECTIVE ATONEMENT.

This method of thought substitutes, for an objective atonement to God for human sin, the mere subjective moral influence of Jesus' life and example. Everything on this theory is internal. Our thoughts are turned within. We hear of salvation by character. The trouble is that we have no character that we can be saved by. Our character is a bad character. We need to hear, not of salvation *by* character, but of salvation *from* character. And over against the bad character of which conscience accuses us, and corresponding to the sense of ill-desert within, is the objective holiness of God which condemns us.

How be rid of guilt for ill-doing and ill-being? This theory can consistently answer only by denying the fact of guilt, and identifying it with subjective impurity. How be free from fear of God's judgment? This theory can consistently answer only by denying that justice in God is anything more than love. The necessity of atonement is removed by annihilating the fundamental attribute of God. Man does not need forgiveness, but only reformation. I do not see how this doctrine of a merely immanent God, working in man's heart, can ever satisfy the clamors of the remorseful conscience, or give peace to the sinner. Nothing but the atonement made to God in our behalf by a crucified Saviour can do that. When we come to the question of salvation, we must remember that it is a transcendent God with whom we have to deal. It is an objective guilt that needs to be removed, a God above us who needs to be reconciled. We want one who has gone into the heavens, and has presented there, as our priest, the blood of Calvary. When we see Christ as our atoning Saviour, then, and not till then, can we sing:

"A guilty, weak and helpless worm
On thy kind arms I fall:
Be thou my strength and righteousness,
My Saviour and my all!"

[By inadvertence, the whole of Dr. Strong's first article was not printed last week. The concluding paragraphs of it are given here, and should be read in connection with the discussion of the Divine Immanence, immediately preceding the article of this week on the Divine Transcendence.]

NATURAL CONSEQUENCES VS. PENALTY.

This method of thought substitutes, for penalty, the mere natural consequences of transgression. Punishment is regarded as

only the reaction of natural law, the impotence of the broken limb, the pain which disease brings in its train. The only results of sin are subjective results. We are told that the present generation has not so great an appetite for retribution as our grandfathers had. It is thought unscientific to insist that there is a soul to be punished—psychology without a soul answers all our needs. And, with belief in a soul, belief also in a God who can destroy both soul and body in hell is relegated to the realm of exploded superstitions.

Now we grant that natural consequences are a part of the penalty of sin, but we deny that they exhaust it. In all penalty there is a personal element—the personal wrath of the Lawgiver—which natural consequences only partially express. The boy's disobedience may have cost him the tearing of his clothes and the bruising of his body, but it is not that which makes him afraid. What he fears is the sight of his father's face, and the infliction of the threatened punishment. So, over and above nature and nature's laws, is the living God, into whose hands it is a fearful thing to fall. Men fear death, because they fear to meet God. Natural law works *before* death—but *after* death comes judgment. When we so exaggerate the doctrine of God's immanence as to deny that there is any difference between this world of probation and the other world of retribution, when we hold out hopes of grace and mercy in the next world to those who die impenitent in this, we are not only going beyond all warrant of Scripture, but we are imperilling men's souls. I know nothing about the terms of salvation but what the Bible tells me, and that speaks of a great gulf fixed, and of a time when change of state is impossible. God is transcendent as well as immanent; before him we are to give account; there is to be a revelation of his righteous judgment different from anything which natural law discloses; "to fall into the hands of the living God" is to fall into the hands, not simply of the law, but also of the Lawgiver.

It costs us too much then to accept the doctrine of the divine immanence as an exclusive statement of the truth. With the loss of the divine transcendence, we lose the personal and living God, identify him with nature, and endanger the most important articles of the Christian faith. We can intelligently hold to Creation, Providence, Miracles, Inspiration, Sin, the Deity and Atonement of Christ, and Future Retribution, only so long as we maintain with the apostle that God is "above all," as well as

"through all" and "in you all." In the course of what has been said, many reasons for belief in God's transcendence have been suggested. But there are certain facts of our mental and moral nature which even more conclusively refute the prevalent exaggeration of God's immanence. These facts I shall hope to set forth in the article which is to follow.

II.

THE TRANSCENDENCE OF GOD: ITS PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS NECESSITY.

IN a former article I mentioned certain modern exaggerations of the doctrine of God's immanence. I wish now to present the claims of a great complementary truth—the truth of God's transcendence. Let us look at it from the points of view, first, of philosophy, and secondly, of religion.

FREE-WILL PROVES TRANSCENDENCE.

There is no fact of our moral nature more important or significant than that of free-will. Free-will is proof that we are not simply *in* nature, but that we are *above* nature. The brute is not so—he is a purely natural being; he acts only as he is acted upon; to use the apt simile of Dr. Samuel Harris, he is like a balloon driven hither and thither unresistingly by the currents that set around him. But man is distinguished from the beast by the fact that in him is a supernatural element; he has a power of initiative and self-movement; he acts, at least sometimes, from within; he is like a ship, which, though subject to influences of wind and tide, can yet set its sails and determine its course at pleasure.

There is, of course, an automatic element in man; heredity and environment and character, to a large extent, bind him; most of his acts are, probably, determined by what he is and by the influences that work upon him. But this is not the whole of him; at times he shows a power to work against his surroundings and his past character, and to strike out a new course; he can act upon nature, and accomplish what nature, left to herself, never could. I show my *freedom* when I decide, after long debate, that I will walk to the centre of the town instead of remaining at my house; I show the *automatic* exercise of will when I put one foot before another, and almost unconsciously take the multitude of successive steps which are necessary to the carrying out of my purpose.

DETERMINISM ONLY A HALF-TRUTH.

Determinism, or the theory that I am merely the creature of my surroundings, takes account of my automatic or executive action, but ignores the higher function of my will—that free choice between alternatives. Consciousness testifies that we are not shut up to one course alone. And when the determinist insists that the freedom of the will is freedom to act only in one way, we reply that such freedom is no freedom at all. "Johnny," says the mother, "did you give your little sister the choice between those two apples this morning?" "Yes, mother," says Johnny, "I told her she could have the little one or none, and she chose the little one." Evidently there was not much freedom there.

Let us deny and denounce the doctrine that the human will can run only in a groove, that it is incapable of unique decisions, that it is a part of nature. But, if *man* be above nature and greater than nature, shall not *God* be so also? And shall we not also deny and denounce the doctrine that *God's* will can run only in a groove, that it is incapable of unique decisions, that it is a part of nature? So the consciousness of a transcendent element in us gives the assurance of a transcendent element in God. Knowing free-will in ourselves, seeing that God has disjoined from himself a certain portion of force and has constituted it into independent wills, we find no difficulty in believing that God has also in nature disjoined from himself certain portions of force, and has made them second causes.

God is not the only agent in the universe. The world is not a ghostly procession of divine ideas. Divine *will* has gone to the making of it. In *nature* we have a realm of necessitated agencies, yet with powers of their own; in *humanity* we have a realm of free beings, not parts and particles of God, but relatively independent of him and capable of subduing nature to their control; in *God* we have the primary Cause of all, free from all limitations except those which he has himself chosen, the Maker of the world and the Lord of it, not buried and hidden within its sequences, not shut up to uniform and automatic action, but able to do unique things, things never done before and never to be done again, like the creation of the world and the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wisdom does not mean monotony with God, any more than it does with us. Single acts with him, as with us, mark crises in the development of his plans and the revelation of his charac-

ter. The laws of nature are the habits of God, but through the laws of nature break now and then flashes of his almightiness that prove him to be not simply an immanent but also a transcendent God.

CONSCIENCE PROVES TRANSCENDENCE.

There is another fact of human nature which throws light upon our subject, and that is the fact of conscience. Conscience witnesses to the existence of an authority above us and above the world. As Diman has said: "Conscience does not lay down a law; it warns us of the existence of a law; and not only of a law, but of a purpose—not our own, but the purpose of another, which it is our mission to realize." In the words of Murphy: "Conscience proves personality in the Lawgiver, because its utterances are not abstract, like those of reason, but are in the nature of command; they are not in the indicative, but in the imperative mood; it says: 'thou shalt' and 'thou shalt not.' This argues Will."

"The atheist," says Tulloch, "regards conscience, not as a skylight, opened to let in upon human nature an infinite dawn from above, but as a polished arch or dome, completing and reflecting the whole edifice beneath." But conscience cannot be the reflection and expression of nature, for it represses and condemns nature. "Like the magnetic needle, it indicates the existence of a mighty power which from afar controls its vibrations, and at whose presence it trembles." The moral law to which it witnesses is not self-imposed, and the threats of judgment which it utters are not self-executing. Conscience is not itself God's voice—it is, rather, the echo of God's voice; it is not God, but a part of self. And yet it tells of something above self and above the world—of God, not as immanent but as transcendent.

CONSCIENCE REFLECTS GOD'S HOLINESS.

This testimony of conscience is the most sublime fact of human nature; and, if we interpret it rightly, it will, more than any other fact of our nature, disclose to us the nature of God. "The relationship between the terms consciousness and conscience, which are in fact but forms of the same word, testifies to the fact that it is in the action of conscience that man's consciousness of himself is chiefly experienced." "As perception gives us Will in the shape of Causality over against us, so Conscience gives us Will in the shape of Authority over against us." It is a perpetual monument

and memento of the Holiness of God, in whose image we are made. We learn that, as Conscience is supreme in the moral constitution of man, and before it every other impulse and affection has to bow, so Holiness is supreme in God and conditions the exercise of every other attribute of his nature.

God's holiness is symbolized and reflected in our moral constitution, but it is not exhaustively exhibited there. That holiness is not only outside of our conscience, but it is greater than our conscience. "If our own heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things." So, in our ethical nature as well as in our voluntary nature, we have the evidence that God not only is "through all" and "in you all," but is also "above all"—in other words, our own being gives us proof that God is transcendent as well as immanent.

EXCLUSIVE IMMANENCE DESTROYS THEISM.

If we give up this transcendence, and believe in nothing but the immanent God to whom so many modern teachers would confine us, we might as well give up our Theism as well as our Christianity. For a God who is simply conterminous with the universe, and necessarily bound up with it, is neither almighty nor sovereign nor blessed nor free. Nothing is left us but a God who is only the obverse side or secondary aspect of the universe itself, a God who is in constant process of growth and evolution, and so is neither infinite nor perfect, neither personal, nor living, nor holy. Since there is no God outside the process of existing things, God exhausts himself in his present work; everything, good or bad, is the best that now can be; even God himself could not better my lot, for he has no strength beyond what he now exerts; there is no eye to pity and no arm to save. This is only the God of pantheism—a blind, dumb idol, substituted for the living God.

But does this exaggeration of the divine immanence cost us the loss of God only? Ah no! we lose man also. For with the freedom and holiness of God, we lose man's freedom and responsibility also. A God who is only another name for natural law must have for his complement a *man* who is but another name for natural law also. Man is but the creature of circumstance; his high ideals are dreams, impossible of fulfilment; there is no God, outside of and above the stream of things, to utter to him words of love or to satisfy his infinite desires; his very being is a mere part of nature, and,

like nature itself, transitory and vanishing: "his self consciousness is a spark struck in the dark, to die away in the darkness whence it has arisen." With what poetic justice is the truth avenged! Man, in his sins, cannot bear the august picture of the God who is above all, and so makes for himself the image of a God confined to nature; but, worshipping this, he finds himself divested of his higher powers of will and conscience, and comes to picture himself also as confined to nature. In attacking God, we ruin ourselves. We tear the crown from our own brows when, in our blasphemy and folly, we "limit the holy One of Israel."

RELIGIOUS VALUE OF TRANSCENDENCE.

But, on the other hand, how great is the advantage to Christian faith and to Christian life of a strong hold upon the truth of God's transcendence! Only as we believe in it, do we apprehend the real greatness of God. The universe is finite, and a God confined to the universe is limited in wisdom and in power. Therefore, the Scripture sets God above, puts his dwelling-place in heaven, represents him as coming down to behold what is going on upon the earth. This, of course, is one side only of the truth, but it is, after all, the most important side. Immanence would be of little value, but for this background of transcendence. But, when we are told that the nations are before him but as grasshoppers, the small dust of the balance of which the tradesman makes no account in weighing, the drop of the bucket that trickles and falls into the well unnoticed, then we begin to appreciate how great a God he is with whom we have to do.

God is not in the universe, so much as the universe is in him. The universe is but the breath of his mouth—the drop of dew upon the fringe of his garment. God has never yet expended the tithe of his resources. Nature only partially reveals him. The eye of imagination can sweep over the whole vast collection of things which he has made, and yet say with Job: "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways, and how small a whisper do we hear of him; but the thunder of his power who can understand?" In God are yet unopened treasures, an inexhaustible fountain of new beginnings, new creations, new revelations. "Mercy shall be built up forever," says the Psalmist—the revelation of God's mercy is an edifice that is ever building, never built; stone shall be added to stone forever. Never throughout the endless future, as Christ leads for-

ward his sacramental host to ever larger knowledge and joy, will there come a time when he cannot turn and say to them: "Greater things than these shall ye see!"

It is a wonderful thing that the humblest believer can call this transcendent God his friend. That an infinite Being should think of me, love me, save me from myself, make me his son and heir, this is something beyond the power of mere human reason to discover or to grasp. But it was precisely to remove my doubts, and to convince me of this, that the transcendent God came out of the light which no man hath seen or can see, and entered into the darkness of this world. A supernatural and miraculous Saviour, God manifested in human flesh, crucified and buried, but the third day risen from the dead—these simple and attested historical facts are my guarantee, as against all speculative difficulties and unbelieving fears, that he is not dead, or shut up in nature, or reduced to mere uniformities of action. In the cross of Christ eighteen hundred years ago, and in the work of the regenerating Spirit to-day, I find the proof and assurance I so sorely need, that there is "One God and Father of all who is above all," as well as "through all, and in you all."

TRANSCENDENCE IN ART.

In many of our cities the "Angelus" of Millet has recently been exhibited. It represents two toil-worn peasants at sunset, ceasing from their work, at the sound of the distant church-bell, to lift up hearts of gratitude and worship to the God above. As the two sombre figures with bowed heads stand there against the evening sky, the whole heaven is luminous and the very silence seems to speak. The picture has been criticised because the landscape is not minutely painted, and the gradation of aerial effects is not technically correct. But the obvious reply is that Millet has aimed to paint, not *air*, but *prayer*. The artist is more than an artist, more than a mere imitator of nature; he sets before us the ideal truth of which nature is the symbol; we see the dignity of humble labor, the dependence of man upon a higher Power, the glory of communion with the infinite and invisible One.

Millet's "Angelus" was born of Bible-reading and religious reverence; it expresses the deep sense of God's transcendence; and this, even more than its artistic quality, makes the picture great. The highest art is the handmaid of religion—that only is the highest art which leads us from nature

up to nature's God. It is not the God who is interfused through all things that is the subject and inspiration of the "Angelus."

The soul, oppressed and benumbed by the unvarying round of nature, seeks outlet and relief; and, if there be no transcendent God, the deepest want of our being is forever unsatisfied. At times we feel that we cannot longer live unless God reveal himself to us. We cry like David: "O Lord, my Rock, be not silent to me; lest, if thou be silent to me, I become like them that go down into the pit." Amid our heavy burdens we pray, as Moses prayed: "I beseech thee, show me thy glory!" And then, while we are hidden from the world as in a cleft of the rock, God makes his glory to pass before us, and proclaims to us his ineffable name, and in the strength of that meat we go many days.

THE BEST PROOF OF TRANSCENDENCE.

So we have proofs of the supernatural, better than any picture can give—namely, the personal dealings of God with our souls. To many and many a Christian the beginning of the Christian life was marked by such a revelation to him of the living God. He has, moreover, the promise of yet other revelations along the Christian way—Christ has given definite assurance that he will manifest himself to his followers as he does not to the world.

It is the business of the believer to seek the fulfilment of this promise—to pray for special communications of this grace and love. But not for his own sake only—for the sake of others also. God certifies himself to the Christian, that the Christian may certify him to the world. So the Psalmist prayed: "O God, forsake me not, until I have showed thy strength to this generation, and thy power to every one that is to come!" In the design of God each individual joined to Christ is to be, in the answers to prayer which he receives, in the pure and spiritual life which he leads, in the benignant and quickening influence which he exerts, a living demonstration of the supernatural, a proof stronger than any syllogism can afford that God has come down out of the heights of his glory to redeem and save. May we not hope that, in spite of the mighty drift of our time toward a denial of God's power and divinity, a multitude of his saints will still have in themselves, and will still give to others, this mightier and more convincing witness to the transcendence of God?

OBER-AMMERGAU AFTER THE "PASSIONS SPIEL."

From *The Church Times* (London,) November 14, 1890.

OBER-AMMERGAU, Oct. 31.

A FEW notes from Ober-Ammergau will be of interest to many. Those who stayed on, after the representations, into the quiet of the week between the Sundays of the season of the Passions Spiel will remember the charms of the village. How much more delightful, then, it is, now that the good people have settled down to their various occupations, may be easily imagined. I would like to mention something which occurred toward the end of the season.

Thursday, September 25th, was the day set apart in this parish for the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. This is taken in turn by all the churches in the diocese of Munich and Friesing, the religious houses taking the nights and the ordinary churches the days, during which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, with a great number of lighted candles. The event which occurred on this Thursday was a Protestant funeral; the first, I believe, since 1860, when the good pastor Daisenberger incurred ecclesiastical censure for himself by according full rites to a Protestant.

On Sunday, September 21st, a young Protestant student from Bonn University was present at the representation. On the Monday he walked to the Crucifixion group, given by the late King Ludwig II., and on his way back he fell down in a fit: he was carried to the hospital and died there. A Protestant military chaplain from Weilheim was telegraphed for, and he conducted the service on the Thursday. The village band, accompanied by the school children and the "Lieder Kranz," together with the priest, Burgomeister, Josef Mayer, and many others, went to the hospital, and from there walked in procession, the band playing solemnly all the way. First came a white cross wreathed, carried by a child; then came the school children; afterward the parochial funeral, processional crucifix, and so on. At the grave side the Protestant pastor, attired in black, with white bands and the peculiar round cap (something like an ordinary German infantry cap enlarged) conducted the service, frequently using the sign of the cross, and delivering a touching address. At the close the "Lieder Kranz" sang a very beautiful hymn unaccompanied. Those attending the funeral held lighted candles.

All this in a thoroughly Roman Catholic part of the world was something not soon to be forgotten. On the Tuesday after the last representation—i.e., September 30th, the whole of the villagers pilgrimaged to Ettal. This they do in the spring and again in the autumn. One noted a fresh idea for English village school processions. All walk on each side of the road; banners or occasional groupings in the middle at intervals, much more dignified in general effect than the usual two and two in the middle of the road, much more convenient also for vehicular traffic. Country parsons should note this for their next school outdoor procession. Another ecclesiastical event was the Festival of the Rosen Kranz (Rosary), October 5th, when the whole parish made a procession of the Blessed Sacrament through the fields, and back to the church. Considering the thorough manner in which the Ober-Ammergauers carry out everything they take in hand, the general effect of this may be easily imagined by those to whom the sight of a foreign procession is familiar, and who remember those large banners on the tall poles in Ober-Ammergau parish church, all of which figured in the procession. Some cows which were quietly grazing, attracted by the children repeating their "Aves" and "Paters," seemed to think it was milking time, and setting off, joined the procession, thereby causing a somewhat unanticipated and grotesque situation.

Sunday, October 12th, was observed as the annual Harvest Thanksgiving in the church. There were no decorations; just a *Missa Cantata* and *Te Deum*. On October 19th came the "Kirche Weih" (Church Dedication Festival), quite a parochial carnival—flag on church tower, etc. This is kept by all the neighboring parishes on the same date, because in years past it made such an upset; one set of villagers visiting another on the festivals to such an extent that it interrupted work, and led to too much pleasure making. Every one goes in for new clothes, as at Easter or Whitsuntide with us.

The usual Church services, of course, *Missa Cantata* 8 A.M., with sermons by the Pfarrer (parish priest). At 5 P.M. an octette played at the "Gasthaus zur Rose," and in the evening there was a good dance—and why not? On the Monday and Tuesday the dancing was kept up again till well in the small hours. On the Monday of the "Kirche Weih" there was a commemorative service of Ober-Ammergauers who have at any time perished in war. All those who have served in the army mustered at the

Burg
by th
whic
urda
seas
stan
his r
lowi
chur
is al
addi
ligh
swor
A
tobe
sion
ziat
ever
thin
tanc
sing
simi
and
I
Req
stri
cam
dow
the
"B
a bl
of a
the
Th
(th
pro
spr
hol
par
me
two
wo
wa
bri
vei
rin
sin
sto
ad
wa
pa
fo
alt
im
th
to
bl
pe
dr

Burgomeister's house at 9 A.M., and, headed by the band playing the same two marches, which every one will remember on the Saturday evenings during the Passions Spiel season, they marched to the church, the standard-bearer, with the Burgomeister on his right, and Josef Mayer on his left, following immediately after the band. In the church, where the catafalque for *Requiem*s is always placed, was a military trophy in addition to the ordinary catafalque with lighted candles, two flags, drums, guns, swords, etc.

After "Kirche Weih" came Sunday, October 26th, the thanksgiving after the "Passions Spiel," with a sermon by the Benefiziat Carl von Brentano, or the Professor, as every one seems to call him, and who I often think bears a slight resemblance in the distance to the late Cardinal Newman. They sing a German *Te Deum* here to a tune similar to "Sun of my Soul" (Hursley), A. and M., with a repeat in it.

I have been present at many funerals and *Requiem*s here, all of which have been very striking; but last Monday, October 27th, I came in for a change in the form of a double wedding of a brother and sister from the same house, that of Sebastian Lang "Bildhauer," the bandmaster, who lives in a blue-coloured house near the theatre. First of all came the civil part of the ceremony at the Rath Haus, which took up some time. The M. C. at all weddings is Thomas Rendl (the "Pilatus"). Rosemary seems to be the proper thing to wear at weddings, a good sprig forming a true, old-fashioned button-hole. The band conducted the wedding party to church, the bridegrooms and their men walking first, and then the brides with two bridesmaids on each side of them. All wore thin shoes and dresses, though there was plenty of snow on the ground. The brides wore black silk dresses with white veils and imitation orange blossom. The ring part of the ceremony in church seemed similar to our own, and the wrapping of the stole round the hands formed an impressive addition. During the *Missa Cantata*, which was well sung (especially an unaccompanied hymn, which was very lovely), the four knelt at a fald-stool in front of the altar.

At the conclusion of the service, all the immediate wedding party, with the brides, their husbands, and the other guests, went to the right side of the altar to drink the blessed wine. It is usual also for all the people to go up to the right of the altar to drink the blessed wine (the love of St. John)

on St. John's Day, December 27th. I am not sure, but I believe this is a local custom. The band escorted the wedding party all the way to the house right at the far end of the village. The husbands and men going first as before, and the brides and their attendants following—picking their way through the snow. On the way, about five young men, running to meet the brides, barred their progress, and they had to pay toll in hard cash. In the house feasting and dancing were kept up till 3 A.M. I should add that the "Pilatus" saw them safely through, both in church and afterward, to the end of the evening.

The next day another wedding of much interest came off, one Josef Albrecht, a promising student at the carving school. The service in church was much the same as on the Monday. In the evening the festivities were held at the "Alten Post Gasthaus," and as "Pilatus" kindly came with a special invitation, I had the privilege of being present at what I would not have missed on any account. After the feast came some dancing to the music of a "sextette;" how gracefully they dance, too! Whatever they are about there is a sort of refinement of manner which one would look for in vain in an English country village. Later on "Pilatus," with a lighted candle in front of him—all being in order—proceeded to toast the bride and bridegroom, and the whole wedding party. He first of all delivered a long and very beautiful speech, written originally for him by Pastor Daisenberger. Those who heard his diction in the Passions Spiel, can well imagine Thomas Rendl standing up in this crowded room in a "public-house" in the midst of the wedding party and many others who were assembled there, and eloquently, with dignified gesture, delivering this oration, which touched upon the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, and how the Father is always at one with His children in their joys as well as their sorrows. He concluded by reciting in German the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria*. Fancy such a speech in an English "public-house" at a wedding feast—but why not?

The speech being concluded he proceeded to "toast," giving first the name in full of each person, and a full description as to relationships, etc., concluding with "*er*—(or '*sie*')—*soll leben!* Hoch! and a flourish—very much a flourish—by the sextette. This, in the case of each person, took some time. Then came more dancing, the bride leading off with a relation of the bridegroom, and

vice versa. After this the presentations—a bottle of wine and a glass, and a large bowl of small cakes in front of the married pair. The master of the ceremonies, sitting to the left of the bridegroom, had a large tureen with a plate on the top, and a book with all the names of the guests. A woman friend of the bride sat to her right, with a napkin having one corner turned over. In addition to the presents usually given, it is the custom for each guest whose name is called out to come up and put money (six or eight marks perhaps) on the plate over the tureen, which is immediately turned into that receptacle; also to give something to the woman friend, who conceals the amount in the napkin. A further present may or may not be given. Each guest shakes hands with the bride and bridegroom, and, after drinking some wine and taking some cake, retires. The amount in the tureen helps to pay the expenses of the wedding and the after festivities, but the husband is supposed to know nothing of the contents of the napkin, which serves as pin money for the bride. The presents were numerous, and of all kinds; rolls of wax taper (used in church at *Requiem*s), coffee-pots and coffee-cups, liqueur sets, beer mugs, vases, and all manner of household implements, down to a feeding-bottle and a small pan they use here for heating infants' food; this was filled with small dolls dressed as babies, and caused much amusement. More dancing followed till 3 A.M.

Another idea for school tea-parties in the country: as to payment of the musicians. Part of the room is reserved for the dancers. At the commencement of each dance each man pays 20 pfennigen (a penny each). The people here are by no means well off, yet they manage to pay. Such a plan would simplify matters and equalize things in charging for a tea-party entrance, and letting the dancers pay extra afterward on the system I have mentioned.

The wedding party met again the next day at the "Lamm Gasthaus" from 4 to 8 P.M. Look at this part of the world. They have "public-houses" proper, and the "public" utilize them. If one could find, or rather if it could only be the proper thing to find the parish priest, the schoolmasters, the village doctor, and the various local luminaries (or those who consider them so), all able to meet on friendly terms for a short convivial time in a "public-house" in England, without coming across any swearing or drunkenness, things would be very different, and a healthier tone would be prevalent.

Here, even in the after "Passion" season, there are nine public-houses for the 1300 inhabitants; there is plenty of room for the people to sit down and talk quietly, or play a harmless game of cards. No swearing, no drunkenness—but that comes of having decent beer. As Archdeacon Farrar says of a crowd, "Here and everywhere it was impossible for an Englishman not to deplore the contrast presented by this crowd and the crowds which assemble at places of amusements on our Bank Holidays. The youths, most of whom had fine, open, honest faces, and wore flowers in their hats or at their button-holes, were all polite and well behaved. Many of them were drinking beer with their lunch, but the beer was thin, wholesome, and perfectly harmless lager beer, on which no one could easily get intoxicated. There was no noise, no rowdiness, no drunkenness, no coarse language, no bad behaviour, but much quiet and courteous happiness. To charge it as a crime against the people of Ober Ammergau that they drink beer is absurd. If no more intoxicating drink than this lager beer were drunk in England, instead of the heady, stupefying, adulterated poison consumed by our own peasantry, it would be well for us. It is a singular incidental sign of the religious spirit of the people that over the brewery which has occupied the Monastery of Ettal since its secularization in 1803 still runs the ancient pious chronogram, 'May God bless the beer of Ettal.' Such are the "gasthauses," not mere beer-houses or gin palaces, sinks of iniquity (which, by the way, "coffee palaces" are equally capable of becoming). One more thing one sees frequently here in the public-houses. Every one may be talking, and suddenly the church bell is heard ringing the *Angelus*. At once every hat is removed, and instead of the ostentatious crossing and gabbling one may have observed elsewhere, all seem quietly intent and self-collected, saying to themselves their "Our Father" and the commemoration of the Incarnation. If people in England could thus pull themselves together, as a mark of respect for the things not of this world in the midst of this "hurrying life," perhaps there would be less drunkenness and gambling, less evil speaking, lying, and slandering, less coveting and obtaining, by one way or another, other men's goods, which is one way of doing "good business." "But, tush! I am puling," as the vicar in the *Sorcerer* observed.

The covered part of the auditorium at the theatre now contains all the rows of seats

piled
Pilat
from
like
when
all
not
"K
the
late
not
acti
tabl
mus
sug
an c
with
it w
up
the
an i
Am
and
Spi
A
whi
eral
sch
wor
figu
beli
gra
now
cro
hav
den
com
dov
An
the
pec
pec
ing
ret
of
the
cos
exp
tha
tha
bec
ma
da
ing
the
are
un
be
di
pi

piled up, also the houses of Annas and Pilate, and the streets of Jerusalem, the front being all boarded up. The stage itself likewise is boarded up, the middle part, where the audience sat in the open air, being all levelled and tidied up till 1900. I do not know whether many know of the "Kreuz Schule," a play given in 1875, after the erection of the "Calvary" given by the late King Ludwig II. I believe it had then not been represented since 1833. The action consists of Old Testament scenes, the tableaux being from the New; there is also music. I ventured, rightly or wrongly, to suggest what a boon it would be to many if an opportunity could be given next year of witnessing this play. The answer was that it would be ruination to the village to be upset again, that if the regular routine of the carving industry suffered from so marked an interruption, all that goes to make Ober-Ammergau what it is would be at an end, and there would certainly be no Passions Spiel in 1900.

A word as to some erroneous impressions, which, I believe, are current. 1. The literal translation of the word "Herrgott-schnitzer" is somewhat misleading; the word simply means carver of the Christus figures for crucifixes. Josef Mayer has, I believe, never carved figures, but he has engraved crosses such as one sees them doing now in the Schnitz Schule. 2. The Kofel cross falling is no such catastrophe as some have made out, indicating the will of Providence that the Passions Spiel shall be discontinued. The cross is frequently blown down and set up again. 3. "The Ober-Ammergauers have been well paid for all the hospitality they have shown," say some people. Have they? I should just like people who say so to have seen all the taking down of beds on hire which had to be returned and paid for. Consider the cost of building the large houses necessitated by the advent of the visitors. Consider the cost of the food, which was much more expensive during the "Passion" season than at other times—so much so, in fact, that to barely cover the cost of their keep it became necessary to insist on visitors remaining two days.

Those who stayed on during the week-days will remember all the extensive washings and preparations for the incursion of the following Saturday. And now that all are steadily at work again, one can better understand what they must have lost by being compelled to abstain from their ordinary vocations while extending their hospitality to the visitors, who after all knew

beforehand more or less what the cost would be. In this connection two "beauties"—a "he" and a "she"—who were staying in the house where I write, being dissatisfied with the homely but excellent table kept by our host, sallied forth in quest of gastronomic indulgence. They returned exulting in that they had made a capital dinner at the Herrgott-schnitzer Cafe, having consumed soup, trout from the Amber, "Ober-Ammergau ducks" (they must have had canvas-back ducks in their minds' eye) and champagne!—a nice prelude to the object of their pilgrimage here. These identical ideals (English, I am sorry to say) happened to sit behind me at the theatre, and during the lovely plaintive music which followed the Crucifixion scene ("Liebe, Liebe") they were chattering away as hard as they could, discussing how the hanging on the cross was managed.

On another similar occasion, some one remarked to some talkative English, "I am afraid this music must interfere sadly with your conversation." Another interesting specimen. An American (*apropos* of the wood carving) "reckoned" it would be a good thing if some one would start a silk factory here, which he "guessed" would be a "darned site better" than all the "cussed" image-making. All these good souls would probably return with mixed impressions, one doubtless being that the Ober-Ammergauers were well paid.

It seems a graceless and disgraceful thing to visit the good people and partake of their hospitality and then to say "they were well paid." They were not well paid; they have, it is true, covered the expenses at the theatre with the receipts for the tickets there, and there is a small surplus for the new hospital. The costumes for the actors were designed by Herr Ludwig Lang, the talented master of the Schnitz Schule here, and cut out by his sister, Fräulein Josefa Lang, who superintended the making of them by the young women of the village who assembled last winter at the Rath Haus for the purpose; and yet I believe many think that these costumes came from the Opera Houses of Munich or Vienna.

Once in ten years is not a very great matter, if a good surplus of profit had remained. The whole ratable value of the community is less than £250 a year, out of which contributions have to go to the salaries of the parish priest, the Burgomeister and his secretary, the expenses of the schoolmasters, and the carving school, so that a little margin once in ten years can hardly be grudged those to whom all Europe is grateful, and

glad enough to come for what can be obtained here—a retreat from the world. And now the village sleeps—so to put it—for ten years, till the beginning of the twentieth century.

Here is a translation of the notice which was posted up in the dressing rooms, and about the back of the stage, on the last Sunday:—"The Passion Play for this century draws to a close, and God's blessing has been visibly with us. Let us, therefore, offer to God our thanksgiving in this last Representation by striving to show forth with that earnestness and dignity of which the story is worthy, the sufferings and death of our Divine Lord and Saviour." They have done their work, and as with everything else, they have done it well. As I write, the village is, perhaps, more lovely than ever it was during the season. It is All Hallow E'en. The mountains and trees are covered with snow, the cross on the Kofel is gleaming in the sun. The good Ober-Ammergauers are straightening-up the churchyard, preparing their graves for "Alle Heiligen."

Many will be sorry to hear that the "Choragus," Jacob Rutz, has just lost a young son, who died suddenly on Wednesday night. He will be buried to-morrow. Would that we in England had more care for our dead and their resting-places!

Many lessons may, indeed, be learned here, and many, doubtless, have been. There is an inexpressible enchantment in this secluded valley, 2800 feet above the North Sea level, specially when the moon and brilliant stars are shining on a snow-clad landscape. A charm lingers about the hill-sides in the remembrance of what has been enacted here, recalling the sentiments which filled one's mind in the fields of Bethlehem, or on the hill-sides of the sea of Galilee. It would indeed be a disaster if too many strangers made this an ordinary resort, though undoubtedly many will come here again to visit the friends who treated them so well this year. It is much to be hoped that the English offering of a new organ for the church here will be largely and liberally supported. Few who came here returned without a warm place in their hearts for the place and people, and that warmth will kindle a desire to co-operate in the scheme for replacing the present broken-down instrument which has to do duty for the services in the church. Donations of any sums from 1s. upward may be sent to Sir Samuel Scott, Bart., & Co., Bankers, 1, Cavendish-Square, W., to order of Sir Samuel Scott, Bart., & Co.

INTERNATIONAL AND INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OF SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.*

BY PROFESSOR SYLVESTER BURNHAM, D.D.

From *The National Baptist*, Philadelphia, December 4, 1890.

THERE are two things I wish to say before reading the paper I have prepared. One is, that I should be most unwilling even to seem to be lacking in regard or respect for those both older and wiser than myself. If I seem, in this paper, to be thus lacking, it is simply because I remembered that the Secretary's bell would ring at the end of twenty-five minutes, and yet I wished to say clearly and plainly what I have to say. The other matter is, that I have not tried to prove all the statements contained in the paper. It was necessary to assume that some things were known to be true, in order to attempt to prove anything in the time allowed me.

The question before us, as I conceive it, is this:

Can the present system of the International Sunday-school Lessons be justly regarded as an ideal, or a final, method for the study of the Bible in the Sunday-school; or ought we to look for something better, which shall replace it? My own position on this question is, that the time has come to lay aside the method of the International Lessons, and to adopt for our Sunday schools a system of lessons more in harmony with the demands of true Bible study. In assuming this position, I do not mean to say that the system of the International Lessons has no merits; still less to claim that it has not been of great service in its day. I would not like to say, moreover, that is not better than the system, or the no-system, of Sunday-school lessons that preceded it.

The Old Chemistry also was a useful science in its day; but we study and teach the New Chemistry now, and do not mourn because the former things have passed away.

In like manner, it is possible that the good thing of yesterday in Bible study may become the hindrance of to-day. My objection to the International Lessons, as an ideal, or final, method of Bible study arises, first, from what I find this system is; and secondly, from what it is not.

First, therefore, the International System of Lessons ought to be replaced by some other method of Bible study, because of what this system is. For the system, in some of its characteristic features, is cen-

* Read at the Baptist Congress, New Haven, Conn., Nov. 12, 1890.

trally
ideas o
Und
Intern
to year
neither
of stud
make i
prophe
to its
studying
some l
Even i
and th
next y
to the
not be
in such
has, in
no stu
any ju
b; th
school
poetry
philos
these
order
ing la
topic
upon
point
of the
can t
dure
fitted
Bu
proce
Every
cours
secur
educ
to gi
tal tr
tema
subje
at.
num
cann
of th
seem
speci
Bible
any
put.
could
if al
chur
only
but
be s
grou

trally and essentially opposed to modern ideas of true educational methods.

Under this head, we notice, first, that the International System proceeds, from year to year, without unity of subject. It aims neither at teaching the whole Bible as a unit of study, nor any one of the elements which make it up, such as history, poetry, law, or prophecy, as a subject by itself. According to its method, one only knows that he is studying some passages, or, at the most, some book to be found in the Scriptures. Even if we have the life of Christ this year, and the reign of the Kings of Judah the next year, and fragments from the epistle to the Romans in the third, still there cannot be said to be any real unity of subject in such a study of the Bible. Such a study has, indeed, its value. It is far better than no study; but it cannot be regarded, with any justness, as ideal or final. What would be thought of a course of study in any school that prescribed history for one term, poetry for the next, logic for a third, and philosophy for a fourth, and then arranged these same subjects in another and another order in successive years, the order depending largely upon fancy, and the particular topic in each subject depending, apparently, upon nothing? Yet, from an educational point of view, this is precisely the method of the International Lessons. How, then, can this system have any just claim to endure for a long time to come, if only the fittest ought to survive?

But, secondly, the International Lessons proceed without definiteness of purpose. Every well-regulated school, and every good course of study, have some definite aim to secure, or else it is condemned by modern educational ideas. It may be sought either to give a definite amount and kind of mental training, or to impart thorough and systematic knowledge on a definite number of subjects; or both these ends may be aimed at. But, so far as appears after quite a number of years, the International Lessons cannot be said to seek, in any real way, either of these objects. Its total result, thus far, seems to be some scrappy information about special portions, larger or smaller, of the Bible, with no very definite indication of any use to which this information could be put. It is not easy to see how the system could have held its ground so long as it has, if all this time there had not been in the church a large amount of ignorances, not only in regard to what the Bible really is, but also as to how and for what it ought to be studied. But a system that holds its ground by the ignorance of its students, or

even the lack of competent teachers, has in itself the reason and the prophecy of its abolishment.

In the third place, the International System is completely ungraded in its material. In this respect, it is utterly opposed to modern educational ideas. One of the points of which its advocates make much is that, by its method, all the Sunday-schools of the world are studying the same lesson in all their classes at the same time. This is exactly what they ought not to be doing. In this matter it is one of the greatest defects of the system. What should we have to say of an educational system, whose boast was that all the schools of the United States, Primary Schools, High Schools, Colleges and Professional Schools, were all engaged at the same hour in the study of the same epoch in history, the same passage in literature, the same problem in mathematics, the same question in philosophy, or the same doctrine in theology? The preposterousness of such a system is clear from the mere statement of the case. The sentimental and empty boast would not keep the system in being a single hour. Can we be justified, then, in adopting for our study of the Bible a method which we would not tolerate for the study of arithmetic and geography? It is absurd to think of teaching Isaiah and Romans, Ezekiel and Colossians, Daniel and Revelation, to the younger classes in our Sunday-schools. We might as well introduce the study of conic sections and metaphysics into our primary schools. If we attempt to teach them to the younger scholars, we shall either fail to teach them anything at all, or only succeed in teaching what is not so. But a system of lessons, which proposes to omit entirely these portions of the Bible from the study of the Sunday-school, surely cannot be called an ideal or a final system of Bible study. Besides, it would practically declare to be true the dangerous heresy that the Bible is not the Word of God, but only *contains* the Word of God. So that, with these parts of the Bible excluded, or included, the International System stands condemned for what it is.

Let us now see, on the other hand, why this system cannot justly claim to be the true system for Sunday-school work because of what it is *not*.

In general, it may be said that the International Lessons lack largely, or entirely, the essential characteristics which, according to modern exegetical science, belong to true Bible study. But true Bible study must meet the demands of exegetical

science, because Bible study is essentially interpretation, and interpretation is a scientific process. It remains, therefore, to point out the essential characteristics which must belong to scientific Bible study, and which the International Lessons do not possess.

In regard to this matter it is to be said, first, true Bible study will be Chronological. By this is meant that each book must be studied as the product of its own particular age; and all the books must be considered in their chronological relations to one another. For the science of interpretation shows us that every book is born out of its own age, and has its birth marks in it. Thus it comes to pass that the same words and the same forms of expression do not, in every age, or in the mouth of every man in the same age, have always the same meaning. If, therefore, we do not know the age of the book we study, and the kind of the book we study, and the kind of thinking and life that characterized the age, we may miss much of the true meaning of the book. Much of our Bible study at the present time, and much of the so highly praised "Bible Readings," err not a little in neglecting this important factor in true Bible study. The work proceeds by words or phrases, and not by attention to dates and ages. Key-words, such as faith, righteousness, Day of the Lord, hell or others of this sort are selected, and passages are made to harmonize in a melody upon this key with little regard to the strain in which they were written at first. But this way of doing is contrary to common sense, and, therefore, contrary to the scientific method. For science, after all, is only systematized common sense. We do not use other literature in this fashion. No one thinks of seeing in the term chemistry in books of a hundred years ago, the meaning which this term now has. No one supposes that the writer of fifty years ago, in speaking of public conveyances, means limited vestibule railway trains. Why should it any more be taken for granted that the faith of Abraham was in all respects like the faith of Paul; or that the hell of a psalm writer was the same as that which Jesus spoke of in awful terms of anxious love and fear? The Bible books were not less inspired because they were born of the age in which they appeared, even as Christ was not less divine because he was human. He was the Son of God, because he was also the Son of man. The Bible is, in the same way, divine, because it is human. Not to study it, therefore, as other books are studied, in its relations to the times that produced it, is to study it falsely. But this

chronological element is left out of the sight almost altogether in the International Lessons.

Secondly, true Bible study will be literary.

By this is meant that the Bible must be studied not so much as a book, but rather as books. In such a study, each book must be taken as a literary whole, in which every part has its meaning in consequence of its relations to this whole. All the parts, moreover, are to be given their meaning in view of the occasion that produced the book and the purpose for which it was written. Nothing can be more absurd than the far too common practice of selecting for study or for a text a few words of the Bible, without any reference to the relation of these words to the thought and aim of the book in which they occur. This is as if the Bible were a scrap-book or a grab bag, in which, by some mysterious providence, a lot of good things had come together to be taken out at random, as some happy fancy might dictate, for pious uses. What should we say of an expounder of the philosophy of Plato, who should attempt to teach us the system of that great thinker by giving us some reflections based upon isolated passages selected at random from his writings? What should we say of such a teacher, if he had never really studied a single work of Plato as a complete whole, so that he did not himself know the relation of his passages to the works from which they were taken? Or what should we say of a physician who should undertake to cure us of a serious sickness, by using prescriptions selected at random from his text-books on Therapeutics? These men we should call quacks: and justly.

We ought never to forget that the Bible is not so truly to be termed revelation, as the history and product of revelation. Facts have always preceded books, if the books have been good for anything. This has been the case also with the Bible books. The New Testament, for example, did not produce Jesus and the church; but Jesus and the church produced the New Testament. Our religion is not the religion of a book, as has been sometimes urged against it; but a religion resting upon historic facts. There is a very important sense in which it still remains the religion for all men and all times, books or no books, inspiration or no inspiration. It is to be remembered that the church was in full being, and men were believing unto salvation in Jesus, before a line of the New Testament was written. The books of the Bible thus had a natural birth out of the needs of men, and the de-

sire of other men to help them; and they were designed by their authors to meet the circumstances of their own time. We cannot reasonably suppose that Isaiah of Jerusalem, when rebuking King Ahaz, or encouraging King Hezekiah, or thundering against the sins of Judah in his day, thought very much of how men would regard his utterances, in 1890 A.D. Or that Paul stopped to consider long how fully he was inspired, when out of a heart hot with grief and indignation, he wrote his burning words to the churches of Galatia; or when, in tender love, he wrote such sweet words of deep affection to his brethren at Philippi. Not in any sense, or in any way, that these words, each and all, were not the words of men moved by the Holy Spirit. But they were also the words of men moved by human occasion and purpose, only rightly to be understood when studied as a part of the world's literature. But that the Bible is literature is a fact which the International System of Sunday-school Lessons seems to leave out of account almost altogether. Its skip-and-jump method is not sufficiently remedied by directions to read what lies between the passages chosen. Even were all this read and studied in the manner in which the selected passages are expounded, still almost no prominence would even then be given to the literary element in the Bible. But this must be constantly before us in any true study of the Scriptures.

In the third place, true Bible study will be historical.

That is, the Bible must not only be studied as books, but as a historical unit—the product and the picture of a developing revelation. Revelation is indeed a unit; but it is also a development. Any true and real meaning of the word revelation must include not only a giving by God, but a receiving by man. To him who receives nothing, nothing can, in any intelligent sense, be said to be revealed. But human receptivity for truth, in the race as in the individual, in the progress from childhood to manhood, has increased by a gradual growth. Revelation, also, to keep pace with the increasing receptivity of man, has been a development. Thus there is a historic order and progress in doctrine in the Bible itself, as well as in the life of the church. Abraham did not see all the truth that was known to Samuel; nor Samuel all that was known by Peter and John. The kingdom of God was one thing to Moses, a somewhat different thing to Isaiah, and another thing yet to Jesus. The hopes for the future that Isaiah had were not the same

as those which Paul sets before us in Ephesians and Colossians. Not that the earlier views and hopes were contradicted by the later, but they were less full and perfect.

It is this historical element in revelation which makes it necessary that a scientific study of the Bible should recognize a Biblical theology as a true and necessary basis for a Christian, and a Baptist theology, and yet as distinct from the latter. Historical theology and systematic theology may both be Biblical, and ought both to be Biblical; but they are not the same thing, for all that. To read into, or out of, a passage in the Psalms or Isaiah the same meaning as if it had been written by John or Paul, even were every word the same in both cases, may be the practice of even some Baptists; but it is neither science nor common sense. The scientific value of many of the proof passages of our systems of doctrine would be found to be absolutely lost, if due regard were paid to the place of these passages in the development of revelation. In this matter, also, our International System of Lessons seems to me to be radically at fault. If the reply be made that this idea of the historical element in revelation cannot be taught to all grades of minds, one may well ask, then, why seek to have as the one system for all minds, in the school of the church, a system which is sure to convey a radically false idea to the minds that are able to receive the truth about the divine revelation?

A failure to recognize the presence and results of the historic element in the Bible, the development in revelation, if it is really there, will introduce a large percentage of error into the results to which any study of the Scriptures will lead us.

The just conclusion, then, seems to be that the time has come for this International System of Bible study, which is opposed to modern educational ideas, and is not able to satisfy the demands of scientific interpretation, to give place to something else, better fitted to survive.

HAMILTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

THE JESUS CHRIST OF THE KORAN.

BY THE REV. S. M. ZWEMER.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch), New York, November 29, 1890.

AUTHORITIES widely differ as to what were the real sources from which Mohammed

drew his historic material for the composition of the Koran. Yet, whatever those sources may have been, Jewish, Gnostic, or Christian, the contents of the book prove beyond a doubt that some of these sources must have been in the main accurate, although much corrupted in their adoption or by their accommodation to the new system. Islam is in some respects a palimpsest of early Arabian Christianity; and if we look beneath the accumulated traditions and corruptions of his followers, and beneath the often incoherent rhapsodies of Mohammed himself, we can see more than dim traces of such Christian concepts as prevailed with the apostle of Arabia. In all missionary effort it is important to know the soil as well as the seed; and in working for Islam, to know what they think of Christ, before we present Christ to them, is not only prudent, but essential.

As Islam is based upon and always finds final proof for its doctrine in the Koran, that book alone can give us the earliest and truest conception among Muslims of the character of Jesus Christ. Following the usual theological analysis of the text-books of Christian doctrine, what did Mohammed teach on the *Person, Offices and States* of the Messiah?

His Person. Though, as is well known, the Koran repeatedly and unequivocally denies the deity of Jesus, the son of Mary, as we understand it (Surahs 2 : 112 ; 19 : 43, etc.), yet certain attributes are assigned to Christ and names given Him, which Mohammed himself acknowledges could only belong to God, and which he did not, therefore, even in his later and most arrogant revelations, claim for himself. Such, for example, are the names : *Al Messiah* (Surah 3 : 40), *The Word of God* (4 : 169), *Spirit from God* (4 : 169); or the attribute of sinlessness which Mohammed never did claim for himself, but which he credits to Jesus the son of Mary, according to the tradition of Anas (Mishkat, book XXIII., chapter 12).

As to Christ's humanity, the Koran acknowledges His miraculous conception and birth. It gives a warped and fantastic account of his life, in which the human element is always prominent, though it is always accompanied by the power of working miracles, and thus shows a divine authority and commission. The third Surah assigns to Christ the power to create, to heal, to cleanse lepers and to raise the dead (vs. 43-46). In the fifth Surah it is stated that God "will chastise" those who believe not in Jesus Christ "with a chastise-

ment wherewith I will not chastise any other creature" (vs. 112-115). Christ's offices, as set forth in the Koran, throw further light on His real mission and power as taught by Mohammed.

His Offices. We find both the prophetic and kingly offices of Christ plainly admitted, if not in all their Christian fulness, yet with undoubted words. He is called a prophet in many places. Of the three hundred and fifteen prophets, or apostles, spoken of by Mohammed, six are dignified by special names—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed. Jesus is called the *Ruhu Allah*, Spirit of God. To Him was committed, and He taught, the *Ingil*, or Gospel. Christ's mission was to the Jews. He came "to confirm the law, and as a guidance and warning to those who fear God" (Surah 5 : 50). Jesus had "clear proofs of this mission," and was "strengthened by the Holy Spirit" (Surah 2 : 81, 254). He taught among the Jews and confirmed His teaching by signs, but they did not believe.

That Jesus was crucified is denied by the Koran (Surahs 3 : 47-50 ; 4 : 155, 156), and the well-known fiction, perhaps borrowed from the Gospel of Barnabas, that Judas was crucified in His stead is substituted. The kingly office of Christ is not so clearly stated as His prophetic work, and yet no less taught by implication. He is called "Illustrious in this world and the next" (Surah 3 : 40); His miracles admit royal power; the following words, which certainly suggest His kingship, are ascribed to Christ (Surah 3 : 44), "I come to you with a sign from God. Fear God and *obey me*;" and finally His power at judgment is that of a king, as well as His exaltation in heaven (Surah 4 : 157). That Christ is a priest could not by any means of interpretation be forced from the Koran or tradition. That vital office which dignifies His work as prophet and glorifies His kingship is absent in Mohammedan Christology. As Sale puts it, "The Cross of Christ is the missing link in the Moslem's Creed; for we have in Islam the strange anomaly of a religion which rejects the doctrine of sacrifice for sin, while its great central feast is a feast of sacrifice." And yet that anomaly of Islam will once be the glory of Christianity when Christian missions will use that great central sacrificial feast at Mecca as convincing proof with Moslems of the necessity of the doctrine of atonement; and so Islam's centre of power will testify against Islam.

The States of Christ. The Koran here is not as explicit as are the traditions based

on it. Of course, by denying the deity of the Messiah, His glory and power from all eternity are also denied, and His miraculous conception and birth become a mere passivity like the creation of Adam. There can be no humiliation unless there be a Son of God. However, that element of humiliation embraced in the *life* of Christ while on earth is to some extent taught. Some Surahs speak of His poverty, and of His persecution and rejection by the Jews. His priestly office not even being hinted at, and His vicarious and expiatory death being denied, the humiliation and suffering of Gethsemane and Golgotha remain excluded from the Koran. As to Christ's exaltation, all Moslems admit that Jesus was miraculously (by deception!) (Surah 4 : 156) taken to heaven, and did not see death or corruption. Mohammed says he saw Jesus and John in the second heaven; others name the third or fourth heaven as His place of abode. The Koran is apparently silent, but tradition based on Surah 4 : 157 holds that Christ is coming again for judgment. "And there shall not be one of the people of the Book but shall believe in Him (Jesus); before His death and in the day of judgment He shall be a witness against them" (4 : 157). After the judgment there will be a sort of carnal millennium. Jesus will live on earth forty-five years, marry and have children, and then again die; wealth will abound, and enmity and hatred cease.

Such is our outline of the character of Jesus and of His mission, as given in the Koran. It is too barren and blasphemous to be called a portrait; it contains too much truth to be stamped a caricature. Aside from criticism, may we not draw two conclusions from its study: 1. That the Christ of the Koran is not the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world; and yet, 2. That this Christ of the Koran may be used to point those who know Him to the "fulness of the Godhead" in the Gospels. That showing to Islam its need of salvation by conviction of sin, corrects and completes Islam's picture of the Saviour of the world. "*Him, therefore, whom ye ignorantly worship, declare we unto you.*"

BEYROUT, Syria.

A HOME MISSIONARY'S HARDSHIPS.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., December 3, 1890.

WITH the commencement of the bleak winter season, it may be well for Christians

housed in comfortable homes, amid the conveniences of town or city life, to think of the home missionary's lot, as a pioneer of the Gospel in the sparsely settled districts of the far West. We do not now have in mind so much those pecuniary embarrassments which arise from a scanty salary and its irregular receipt. Home missionaries are not the only ministers of our own, or of other churches, acquainted with that sort of thing. Many a preacher in Eastern cities finds it hard to comply with the injunction to show hospitality, or even to abide by that other apostolic exhortation, to owe no man anything. In this the lot of the home missionary is not unique, though there are often bright times too for him, as there are for other ministers of the gospel.

We have in mind, rather, the peculiar trials arising from the very nature of his field of labor. Often he serves two or more widely separated congregations. His people live at long distances apart. In addition to preaching at the regular places of worship, he feels compelled by circumstances to maintain services at outlying school-houses, or at remote farms. Only thus can the entire circle of people who have a claim upon him, and for whose welfare he is yearning, be served with the Gospel. In new sections of the country the roads are never too good; and winter and spring sometimes see them impassable. The Lord's Day under these conditions calls for an amount of physical exertion, and entails a nervous strain that may tell on the stoniest constitution. During the week much driving in the night air is almost inevitable if the home missionary is faithful and energetic, for prayer-meetings must be maintained at various points.

Cases exist, also, where the good brother must eke out his salary by being the school-teacher for the community or congregation during the week; and must in a certain period of the year lengthen his never too short hours of teaching, in order to give special religious instruction to the candidates for confirmation. Possibly, even beyond and above all this, he is expected to obtain part of his subsistence and that of his family, from the cultivation of a patch of land. Where he finds time for study and intellectual growth as a minister must be somewhat of a mystery, if he is hampered by the above conditions of life.

Withal, in those communities where a home missionary generally finds his field, few experienced Christian workers are to be found. The minister must be in the forefront, the head and leader not only in the Church, but also in the various spheres of

public charity and in schemes for the advancement of the intellectual and moral tone of the community at large. Unless he is a man of affairs, he will often be made to feel at a decided disadvantage.

And yet opposition to religion and to Christian organizations is apt to be outspoken and reckless in new communities to an extent unknown in the older parts of the land, where propriety exacts silence and transmutes dislike into indifference, even though a contempt of religion may lurk beneath the surface. In the field where the home missionary labors, many more men will be found who seem to experience no sense of shame in championing irreligion or in exhibiting profanity. The fight in which he is engaged is, therefore, apt to be peculiarly severe. The responsibility of successfully maintaining his championship of the Gospel of Christ is constantly present, and often rests upon him anxiously, as he faces new combinations of wickedness and new devices of bad men.

With it all he is not always made to feel that the Church at his back, the Church which has sent him to do pioneer work, is loyally appreciative of his firm fidelity and cheerful self-denial. And this feeling may be as severe a foe of his usefulness as any of those enumerated before. To be convinced that the mass of his fellow-Christians who bear the same name with him regard his honest endeavors and hard struggles with unconcern may unnerve and weaken him far more than do the discouragements which he faces in the front.

Brethren, let us deprive *our* home missionaries of any feeling that we are indifferent to their self-sacrificing labors of love. They themselves are worthy of every sign of our appreciation. Their work is in a line with that of their comrades in other Churches, which is the hope of our country's future. To the home missionaries the great West owes, and will in the end owe, more than it does to the pioneers of commercial enterprises. And for the future of our own Church in particular, the success of their efforts is essential. We must go forward. We dare not go back. We cannot stand still. Stagnation means slow death.

Let us all loyally do our very best for our home missionaries personally, and aid in mitigating those of their hardships that can be mitigated from a distance. Though the writer can write only from observation, he knows whereof he writes, when he depicts the hardship and withal the importance of their work. By helping to sustain them

individually and by faithfully supporting the entire enterprise of which they are the working force, we shall be doing the Lord's work in a way acceptable to Him Who came to seek and to save the lost.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

A NEW AKKADIAN STORY OF THE CREATION.

BY THEODORE G. PINCHES, OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

From *The Independent*, New York, December 4, 1890.

PASSING rich has been the harvest which has rewarded the laborers in the domain of Assyrian research, and even now the whole is not reaped. Who would have thought that, in addition to the two legends of the Creation now known to have existed with the Babylonians and Assyrians, another would be found? Yet it is so; and this third legend of the Creation possesses a special interest, for it is written not only in Semitic Babylonian, but also in the Akkadian language. It forms, in fact, the introductory part of a bilingual incantation, and, as such, has a distinctly Akkadian impress. It may therefore be regarded as a special and independent version which originated, at a very early period, with that nation.

The tablet bearing this important record is of baked clay, and was found by Mr. Rassam at Kouyunjik in 1882. The writing is in the Babylonian style, and is very small and close. The lower portion of the obverse and the upper portion of the reverse is broken away, but the most important part of the text is well preserved, as the following translation will show:

TRANSLATION.

The glorious house, the house of the gods, in a glorious place had not been made;

A plant had not grown, a tree had not been formed;

A brick had not been laid, a beam had not been shaped;

A house had not been built, a city had not been constructed;

A city had not been built, a foundation had not been gloriously made;

Niffer had not been built, E-kura had not been constructed;

Erech had not been built, E-ana had not been constructed;

The abyss had not been made, Eridu had not been built;

(As for) the glorious house, the house of the gods, its seat had not been constructed;

The whole of the land and the sea also,

When within the sea there was a stream.

In the
structed
E-sag
within t
Babyl
He ma
The g
heart, h
Merod
water;
He m
The g
joy of h
He m
Aruru
him.
The v
the desc
He m
the Eup
Well
The u
the recd
He m
The l
The c
heifer,
Plant
The l
The
mound

[He

[He

[He

[He

ously,

He b

[He

*

In

staten

arrang

period

chapt

gree,

the v

Smith

or of

even

earth

" w

B

(as t

impl

with

deser

temp

not

grea

the l

prob

the

Niff

E-k

In that day Eridu was built, E-sagila was constructed.

E-sagila which the god Lugal-du-azaga founded within the abyss.

Babylon was built, E-sagila was completed.

He made the gods and the Anunnaki altogether.

The glorious city, the seat of the joy of their heart, he proclaimed supremely.

Merodach bound together the *amam* before the water ;

He made dust, and poured it out with the flood.

The gods were to be made to dwell in a seat of joy of heart.

He made mankind.

Aruru, the seed of mankind, they made with him.

The beasts of the field, the living creatures of the desert he made.

He made and set in their place the Tigris and the Euphrates ;

Well proclaimed be their name.

The *ussu*-plant, the *dittu*-plant of the marshland, the reed, and the forest he made ;

He made the verdure of the desert ;

The lands, the marshes, the greensward also.

The ox, the young of the horse, the stallion, the heifer, the sheep, the locust

Plantation and forest also

The he-goat and the gazelle came before (?) him.

The lord Merodach on the sea-shore filled up a mound

formerly had not been

he caused to be

[He caused the plant to grow], he made the tree

he made in its place

[He laid the brick], he shaped the beam

[He built the house], he built the city.

[He built a city], he made the foundation gloriously.

He built [Niffer, the city of] the temple E-kura

[He built Erech, the city of the temple E-ana].

* * * * *

In this collection of rough-and-ready statements we miss the usual symmetry of arrangement of the acts of creation into periods, so excellently shown in the opening chapter of the Bible, and, to a much less degree, in the Babylonian story first given to the world of to-day by the late George Smith. There is no mention of the heavens or of the heavenly bodies, and there is not even a statement as to the creation of the earth, though some such condition as

"When on high the heavens proclaimed not,
Beneath the earth recorded not a name"

(as the other Babylonian version has it) is implied by the opening lines. It begins with the time when the earth was waste and desert, and when the glorious cities and temples so dear to the Babylonian heart had not yet been built. Merodach poses as the great creator, and does not seem to divide the honor with Tiamat (who, however, was probably only regarded as the producer of the lower forms of life). Not only did Niffer and Erech, with their great temple E-kura ("the house of the earth"), and

E-ana ("the house of heaven") not exist, but Eridu ("the good city") and the abyss, apparently corresponding with paradise and hades, were still things of the future, and the home of the gods was as yet unmade. "When within the sea there was a stream (*inu-sa kirib tãmtim ratumma*) in that day Eridu was built, E-sagila was constructed—E-sagila which Lugal-du-azaga founded within the abyss." (*E-sagila sa ina kirib apsi Lugal du azaga irmã.*) This E-sagila, or "house of the high head," the name of a celebrated temple town at Babylon, was apparently the extra-terrestrial prototype of the latter. Then comes the building of Babylon, and *after that*, the creation of the gods and the Anunnaki (or spirit of the earth), the city of the gods, and the making of the land. The creation of mankind, the seed of mankind (apparently personified by the god Aruru), the animals, the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, plants, the different kinds of land, etc., and lastly, the cities Niffer and Erech, all by Merodach, follow in strange medley.

Uncouth as the diction is, this version of the Creation-legend has a fair amount of importance. Distinctively Akkadian, it treats of things from an Akkadian point of view. There is no appearance of any violent contest between chaos and the heavenly powers, such as we meet with in the account in Smith's "Chaldean Genesis." A legend originating among a people who loved peace, it tries to explain those things which interested themselves, and it treats of these things in its own way.

DR. LIDDON'S WILL.

From *The Church Times*, London, November 14, 1890.

THE value of the personal estate of the late Dr. Liddon has been sworn at £47,226. The will, dated November 24th, 1885, begins: "First, I commit my soul into the hands of Almighty God, trusting to obtain His mercy only through the merits of Jesus Christ, and firmly believing the Christian faith as held by the whole Catholic Church before the division of East and West and by the Church of England." It was the testator's desire to be buried in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral. He bequeaths to Canon Paget, the Rev. Charles Gore, librarian of the Pusey Library, and the Rev. J. O. Johnston, of Keble College, all his manuscripts and letters, trusting to them, in conjunction with his sisters, Mrs. King and

Mrs. Gibson Ambrose, to destroy such as should be destroyed, with liberty to publish or arrange for the publication, should it not be already completed, of the Life of Dr. Pusey, "bearing in mind," the testator adds, "that my present notes are not, in my judgment, ready or fit for publication as they stand." His theological, historical, and liturgical books Canon Liddon bequeaths to Keble College Library. He bequeaths to the Trustees of the Pusey Memorial all books having the name or handwriting of Dr. Pusey, and all letters to the testator from the Rev. J. Keble or Cardinal Newman, for the library of Pusey House, and in the case of all books given by him to the Pusey, Keble, or other Library, he desires that a plate or inscription to that effect shall be inserted in them by the librarians of such institutions respectively. Canon Liddon bequeaths £500 each to his brothers Edward and John, as executors of his will; £1000 to his cousin, the Rev. Henry John Liddon; £1000 to the Warden of Keble College and Mr. J. A. Shaw-Stewart, to add to the endowment of the Scholarship in Keble College recently founded by the testator for the encouragement of the study of divinity; £1000 to Lord Beauchamp and Lord Halifax, to add to the capital of the Pusey Memorial Fund; £250 to the Bishop of Colombo, for the purposes of his diocese; £250 to the Missionary Bishop in Central Africa, for the general work of the Mission, or, if desirable, toward a cathedral church at Zanzibar; £250 to the Bishop of Lincoln, for the Oxford Mission to Calcutta; £250 to the Bishop of Oxford, for the purchase of works of the Catholic Fathers for Cuddesdon College; and £250 to All Saints' School, Bloxham, for the purchase of works of the Ancient Fathers of the Catholic Church of Christ, or of the Rev. Dr. Pusey or the Rev. John Keble. There are legacies to all the testator's servants. The residuary estate is divided among the brothers and sisters of the deceased.

THE LATEST RESULTS OF ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), December, 1890.

A YEAR ago I gave a short account of the startling archæological discoveries which had just been made in Arabia. The explorations of Doughty, Euting, Huber, and above all, Glazer, the inscriptions they had found, and

the historical facts disclosed by the decipherment of the epigraphic material, have thrown a sudden and unexpected flood of light on a continent which has hitherto been darker even than Central Africa. The members of the last Oriental Congress heard with astonishment that a country which had been supposed to be little more than a waste of sand and rock, inhabited by wandering nomads, and first appearing on the page of history in the time of Mohammed, had really been a centre of light and culture in remote ages—a land of active trade and commerce, which once exercised an important influence on the civilized world of the ancient East, and possessed an alphabetic system of writing earlier, it would seem, than that which we know as the Phœnician alphabet.

I was able to give only a brief outline of the results that had been announced by scholars in the new field of research. A large portion of the inscriptions on which they were based had not been published, and the work promised by Dr. Glaser, on the ancient geography of Arabia, had not appeared.* Moreover, there had not yet been time for the special students of Arabian history and epigraphy to criticise the conclusions at which scholars like Professor D. H. Müller, or Dr. Glaser had arrived.†

A year has passed, and we have now had time to take a sober review of the new discoveries, and examine their weak points. In one respect, the history of ancient Arabia which I laid before the readers of the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW* must be modified. Professor D. H. Müller was too hasty in ascribing an early date to the inscriptions of Lihhyān in Northern Arabia. Instead of belonging to the tenth, or even the seventh, century before our era, it is now evident that they are not earlier than the fall of the Roman Empire. They are strongly influenced by the religious ideas and technical terms of Judaism, and belong to the period when Jewish colonies and Jewish proselytism were rapidly extending through Arabia. The kingdom of Lihhyān rose and decayed at no long interval of time before the birth of Mohammed.

On the other hand, further study has gone to confirm Dr. Glaser's view of the great antiquity of the Minæan kingdom, and of the spread of its power from the south of Arabia to the frontiers of Egypt and Palestine.

* Dr. Glaser's large and learned volume on the ancient geography of Arabia has now been published (*"Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens,"* vol. II., Berlin: Weidmann), and contains a wealth of information on subjects like the site of Ophir, or the geographical knowledge of Ptolemy.

† *"Skizze der Geschichte Arabiens,"* Part I. Munich: Straub.

There can be no doubt that it preceded the rise of the kingdom of Saba, the Sheba of the Old Testament. There was no room for the contemporaneous existence of the two monarchies; geographically they covered the same area, and the cities of Saba were embedded, as it were, within the territory of Ma'in. But the Sabæan cities flourished at the expense of those of Ma'in, and later tradition forgot even the names of the old Minæan towns.

The kingdom of Saba was already flourishing when Tiglath-Pileser and Sargon ruled over Assyria, in the eighth century B.C. And not only was it flourishing, its power had extended far to the North, where the Assyrian monarchs came into contact with its king. The visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon carries back the foundation of the Sabæan monarchy to a still earlier date. Unless we are to suppose that the visit is the invention of a later writer, we must conclude that nearly ten centuries before the Christian era Saba had already superseded Ma'in, and that the old kingdom, with its trade and culture, its fortified cities and inscribed walls, had already passed away. The fact would explain why it is that classical writers know only of a Minæan people, not of a Minæan kingdom, and that even in the pages of the Old Testament, while references occur to Sheba, only a careful search can detect the name of Ma'in.

Dr. Glaser has shown that the "kings" of Saba were preceded by the Makârib, or "high-priests" of Saba. Here, as in other parts of the Semitic world, the priest-king was the predecessor of the merely secular king. The State was originally regarded as a theocracy, and it was some time before the priest and the king became separated from one another. We are reminded of the history of Israel, as well as of Jethro, the "priest of Midian." As in Assyria, where there were "high-priests of Assur" before there were "kings of Assyria," the State was represented by a deity whose name it bore, or who derived his name from the State. Saba, like Assur, must once have been a god.

We are already acquainted with the names of thirty-three Minæan Sovereigns. Three of them have been found by Professor Müller in inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Teima, the Tema of the Old Testament, in Northern Arabia, on the road to Damascus and Sinai. Their authority, therefore, was not confined to the original seat of Minæan power in the South, but was felt throughout the length of the Arabian peninsula. The

fact is confirmed by an interesting inscription copied by Halévy in Southern Arabia, which has been deciphered by Professor Hommel and Dr. Glaser. It tells us that it was engraved by its authors in gratitude for their rescue by Athtar and other deities "from the war which took place between the ruler of the land of the South, and the ruler of the land of the North," as well as "from the midst of Egypt (*Mitsr*) in the conflict which took place between Madhi and Egypt," and for their safe restoration to their own city of Qarnu. The authors of the inscription, Ammi-tsadiq and Sa'd, further state that they lived under the Minæan King, Abi-yada' Yathi', and that they were "the two governors of Tsar and Ashur and the further bank of the river."

Professor Hommel has pointed out that in Ashur we have an explanation of the Asshurim of the Bible, who are called the sons of Dedan (Gen. xxv. 3, 18), while Tsar must be a fortress often mentioned on the Egyptian monuments as guarding the approach to Egypt, on what would now be the Arabian side of the Suez Canal. Madhi Dr. Glaser would identify with Mizzah the grandson of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 17), but the other references in the inscription are obscure. It proves, however, that the power of the Minæan princes was acknowledged as far as the borders of Egypt, in what Professor Hommel believes to have been the age of the Hyksos; that their authority was recognized in Edom is shown by an inscription in which mention is made of Gaza.

It would thus appear that Palestine, or at all events the tribes immediately surrounding it, were in close contact with a civilized power which had established trade routes from the South, and protected them from the attacks of the nomad Beduin. The part now performed, or supposed to be performed by Turkey, was performed before the days of Solomon by the princes and merchants of Ma'in. A conclusion of unexpected interest follows this discovery. The Minæans were a literary people; they used an alphabetic system of writing, and set up their inscriptions, not only in their Southern homes, but also in their colonies in the North. If their records really mount back to the age now claimed for them—and it is difficult to see where counter-arguments are to come from—they will be far older than the oldest known inscription in Phœnician letters. Instead of deriving the Minæan alphabet from the Phœnician, we must derive the Phœnician alphabet from the Minæan, or from one of the Arabian alphabets of which

the Minæan was the mother; instead of seeking in Phœnicia the primitive home of the alphabets of our modern world, we shall have to look for it in Arabia. Canon Isaac Taylor, in his "History of the Alphabet," had already found himself compelled by palæographic evidence to assign a much earlier date to the alphabet of South Arabia than that which had previously been ascribed to it, and the discoveries of Glaser and Hommel show that he was right.

As soon as we reverse the problem and assume that the Phœnician alphabet is later instead of earlier than the Minæan, we obtain an explanation of much that has hitherto been puzzling. The names given to many of the Phœnician letters are at last found to agree with the forms of the latter. It is only in the South Arabian alphabets, for instance, that the letter called *pe*, "the mouth," our *P*, has the form of a mouth, or that the first letter *aleph*, "an ox," really resembles the head of that animal. Moreover, we can now understand how it is that the South Arabian alphabets possess letters which do not occur in the Phœnician alphabet, and are not derived from any of the Phœnician characters. The Phœnician language had lost certain sounds which comparative philology has shown belonged to the Semitic Parent-Speech, and which were preserved in the languages of Arabia. That these sounds should have been represented by special symbols in the Arabian alphabets, if the latter had been borrowed from the defective alphabet of Phœnicia, is unintelligible; in such a case the symbols would have been modifications of other symbols already existing in the alphabet, or else the same symbol would have been allowed to express more than one sound. This has actually happened in Hebrew, where the same symbols stand respectively for *'ain* and *ghain*, for *s* and *sh*. There can be but one explanation of the fact that the Arabian alphabets denote by independent symbols certain sounds which had been lost in Phœnician pronunciation; the Arabian alphabets are more primitive than the alphabet of Phœnicia. When the latter first comes before us, it is in a comparatively late and conventionalized form, widely removed from the hieratic characters of Egypt, out of which it is commonly supposed to have been developed.

The discovery of the antiquity of writing among the populations of Arabia cannot fail to influence the views that have been current of late years in regard to the earlier history of the Old Testament. We have

hitherto taken it for granted that the tribes to whom the Israelites were related were illiterate nomads, and that in Midian or Edom the invaders of Palestine would have had no opportunity of making acquaintance with books and written records. Before the time of Samuel and David it has been strenuously maintained that letters were unknown in Israel. But such assumptions must now be considerably modified. The ancient Oriental world, even in Northern Arabia, was a far more literary one than we have been accustomed to imagine; and as for Canaan, the country in which the Israelites settled, fought, and intermarried, we now have evidence that education was carried in it to a surprisingly high point. In the principal cities of Palestine an active literary correspondence was not only carried on, but was maintained by means of a foreign language, and an extremely complicated script. There must have been plenty of schools and teachers, as well as of pupils and books.

The latest revelation that has been furnished to us by the tablets of Telel-Amarna relates to Jerusalem. Among the tablets now in the Museum of Berlin, five have been found which prove, upon examination, to have been letters sent from the King or Governor of Jerusalem to the Egyptian Sovereigns in the century before the exodus. The Governor in question was named Abdi-dhaba, or Ebed-tob, as his name would have been written in Hebrew. He describes himself as occupying a more independent position than the governors of most of the other towns of Palestine. They were merely Egyptian officials; he, on the other hand, though he owed allegiance to the Egyptian monarch, nevertheless claims to have derived his power from "the oracle of the mighty king." As one of the letters shows that this "mighty king" was not the king of Egypt, but a deity, we are irresistibly reminded of Melchizedek the king of Salem, and priest of "the most high God," from whom therefore the king derived his authority. Last spring I had already recognized the name of "Urusalim" or Jerusalem in one of the Telel-Amarna tablets at Cairo, and one of those which I copied in the collection of M. Bouriant tells us what was the local name of the "most high God." The tablet is unfortunately broken; but on one side of it we read: "The city of the mountain of Jerusalem, the city of the temple of the god Uras, (whose) name (there is) Marru, the city of the king which adjoins (?) the locality of the men of Keilah."

Marru
Arama
with t
stood o
Moria
Long
the ter
stood i
tuary.

The
which
and th
one of
lem is
as a sh
of the
quests
lonian
Nahan
throw
the Be
pation
that c
must
conqu
Moria
career
star of

Lig
Egypt
been t
He tel
pelled
a defe
would
"the
"Ass
synon

Bu
Amar
the hi
of Isr
umen
may c
of th
tribes
tions
Homi
tions
lau'a
The v
Hebr
Jethr
were,
hood,
Mose
Homi
persp

* "A
Literat
Munich

Marru seems to be the same word as the Aramaic *maré*, "lord"; he was identified with the Babylonian Uras, and his temple stood on "the mountain" which was called Moriah, perhaps in remembrance of the god. Long before the days when Solomon built the temple of Yahveh the spot on which it stood had been the site of a hallowed sanctuary.

The tablets at Berlin refer to transactions which had taken place between Addi-dhaba and the "Kassi" or Babylonians, and in one of them an oracle of the god of Jerusalem is quoted which declared that, "so long as a ship crosses the sea—this (is) the oracle of the mighty king—so long shall the conquests continue of Nahrma and the Babylonians." Since Nahrma is the Aram-Naharaim of the Old Testament, light is thrown on the account which is given us in the Book of Judges of the eight-years' occupation of Southern Palestine by the king of that country. In Chushan-rishathaim we must see a successor of the princes whose conquests were proclaimed by the oracle on Moriah. It was an anticipation of the career which Balaam predicted for "the star of Jacob."

Light is also thrown on a statement of the Egyptian historian, Manetho, which it has been the fashion to treat with scant respect. He tells us that when the Hyksos were expelled from Egypt they built Jerusalem, as a defence—not against the Egyptians, as would naturally be expected—but against "the Assyrians." In the age of Manetho "Assyrians" and "Babylonians" were synonymous terms.

But though it is to the tablets of Telel-Amarna that we must look for light upon the history of the Canaan which the tribes of Israel invaded, it is rather from the monumental records of ancient Arabia that we may expect to draw our chiefest illustrations of the inner life and belief of the invading tribes themselves. One of these illustrations has already been indicated by Professor Hommel.* In one of the Arabian inscriptions discovered by Euting we find the word *lau'an* used in the sense of "priests." The word is etymologically the same as the Hebrew *Levi*; and when we remember that Jethro, the priest of Midian, watched, as it were, over the birth of the Israelitish priesthood, and had as his son-in-law the Levite Moses, there opens out for us, as Professor Hommel remarks, "a new and unexpected perspective in the history of religion."

* "Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Kunde der Sprachen, Literaturen und der Geschichte des vorderen Orients." München.

THE GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY.

BY W. R. HUNTINGTON, D.D., D.C.L.

From *The Sunday School Times*, Philadelphia, December 13, 1890.

THE Christmas angels open their announcements with an exhortation not to be afraid. It is strange that we should have to be cautioned against fright when it is a question of "good" tidings. Fear is not a feeling that commonly enters into our anticipations of what is pleasant. Messengers of calamity we dread, but the bringers of such news as is good we welcome. And yet, looking back, we find it to have been the case that each of the two very best announcements ever made to man had to be ushered in with a "Fear not."

Both the angel who tells that Christ is born, and the angel who tells that Christ is risen, has this preface on his lips. They seem to have thought that they had no chance of getting audience unless first they could allay alarm.

The reason is not far to seek. We fear what is unusual—out of the common. It was a new thing to those men of Bethlehem to see heaven opened. They were not accustomed in their night watches to have the darkness lightened without warning. Dangers there were, no doubt, on that hill-side of theirs; robbers and wolves they had to guard against as best they might; but these were perils of an earthly and familiar sort. But who could know what disaster might be hidden under the approach of a visitor whose very voice and raiment were of a startling sort? Who could say what deadly influence might, or might not, lurk in the strange light that threw such sudden glory over turf and sheep?

The key to the significance of the whole passage lies in what the angel and his associates say. The shepherds interest us by their *naïveté*, but have nothing of moment to communicate. They are the pupils, not the teachers. The stress should be laid wholly on the angelic utterances. In other words, the doctrine of the Word made flesh is the real lesson of Christmas.

The Son of God became the Son of Mary in order that heaven might cease to be the dim, uncertain thing it had been, and that the King of heaven might cease to seem the very distant potentate he had seemed. This is the special felicity that attaches to the religion called the gospel. Without at all derogating from the awfulness of God, without impairing in the least degree the brightness of the divine majesty, it does yet

succeed in making deity a veritable God-with-us. Nowadays, when we are so often bidden, sometimes petulantly, sometimes scornfully, sometimes bitterly, to surrender our confident loyalty toward him who was "conceived by the Holy Ghost," at the cost, unless we do so, of being sent to the rear, among the ignorant, the cowardly, and the stupid, it is a helpful thing to study the contrast which this aspect of the faith affords to whatever in the present is offered, or ever has been offered in the past, as a substitute for what we believe.

Take the heathen religions, ancient and modern. Can it be truly said of them that their first word to man, or, for that matter, their last word, is "Fear not"? On the contrary, is it not true of them, that their word, first, last, and always, is "Be afraid"? False religion perverts the natural awe men feel in the presence of the great things of God's universe into a superstitious dread; turns wonder at the stars into fear of their malign influence, and translates the voices of the storm into the mutterings of ghostly vengeance. Out of soil thus prepared spring up bloodthirsty idolatries, and all sorts of caricatures of the truth that men ought to fear God. For a truth it is, after all, frightfully distorted as it may have been: and a truth, moreover, which the herald angels at Bethlehem by no means meant to contradict—that men ought to fear God. There is a fear of God which "the thankless and the unholy" do well to entertain, so long as they cling to their thanklessness and unholiness. And again, there is a fear of God which even his reconciled children must always have, so long as they worthily appreciate his majesty—a fear which is the same thing as reverence, and admits of the prefix "holy." In both of these ways, so long as men are what they are, the fear of God must always have a place in religion.

But it is not in these ways at all that the false religions call on men to fear their deities. The priest of an idolatry says: "Here is this great god, whose image we keep in our temple, and who does what we ask him to do. You have offended him." "How?" asks the worshipper. "By anything wrong that I have done? By lying, by cheating, by cruelty, or drunkenness?" "Oh, no! He cares nothing for matters of that sort. You have offended him by not paying proper tribute to us, his priests. Atone for this, or presently we shall tell the god to spoil your harvests, or disappoint you in the chase." The false religion, that is to say, seeks to make people fear God for reasons the very opposite of those for which

they ought to fear him. The true faith teaches that the heavenly Father is one who delights to bless, and who punishes only when, and in so far as, righteousness makes it necessary; while the idolater worships a god of whom he believes that he will certainly do him all the harm he can, unless by some means he shall meanwhile be bribed or cajoled into doing otherwise.

What is more to the point, Christian people themselves take this same heathenish ground when they credit divine Providence with all the hard and disagreeable and troublesome and afflictive things that come into their lives, and never once truly from the heart thank God for sending the good things as well. This is strictly and accurately heathenish; for the heathen is not a heathen in that he fears, but in that he fears on mistaken grounds and in a wrong way.

Again, there is the contrast between the gospel way of looking at things, and that which is offered to us as a substitute for it, not by the heathen, but by those who loudly assert for themselves a more generous enlightenment than is enjoyed by the rest of us. We are assured by the nature worshippers that the only reasonable course for man is to reconcile himself as best he may to the iron rule of law. As for the unfortunates who come into the world poorly equipped for the struggle with the forces that continually make war on man from the cradle to the grave, the best wish that we can wish them is that they may yield up, as soon as possible, the existence they are so ill fitted to sustain. And as for our own future, so these new prophets go on to tell us, we know nothing at all about that. Of a life other than this which we are now living, Nature has no word to say; and since she is silent, we must, by necessary consequence, be silent too. Evidently these are tidings that deserve any adjective epithet rather than "good."

From thoughts of this sort born of a partial and one-sided study of the truth of God, the cheerful voices that sound out from Bethlehem recall us. "Fear not," the angel said; "for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

"All people" is a large phrase, in no wise suggestive of a restricted blessing. It could not have meant the people who were then living on the earth; for the language is the language of prediction, and to the reach of the future covered by it there is no limit set.

And not only so. Let it be noted that Christmas stands for the presence in all true

religion
genial
human
ing of
ing an
erally
Christ
out of
and th
this co
mas w
If, o
the me
of mir
such a
pected
the fe
The
though
There
is mor
most
comm
us to
burde
veriti
ing th
and d
in tu
angel
or a v
the e
ing o
the f
of a
bluff
utter
dism
flower
say,
Crea
the
us in
hem
knit
we
char
in th
deity
out
dear
T
chil
—w
and
wha
the
by i
that
fulf
bea

religion of what we may denominate the genial element. The common instinct of humanity has rightly interpreted this meaning of the day by making it a time of rejoicing and festivity. Christian men have generally agreed in thinking that the coming of Christ, while it did not take the solemnity out of human life, did take gloom out of it, and the horror. They have emphasized this conviction by their keeping of Christmas with mirth and gladness.

If, often and again, it has happened that the merry-making has obscured and put out of mind the spiritual joy, the answer is that such abuse is only what might have been expected, and is no argument against keeping the feast as it ought to be kept.

There is something very winning in this thought that true religion has its genial side. There is great comfort in believing that God is more like man, and heaven more like the most perfect home-life of earth, than people commonly suppose; and Christmas does help us to believe this. When the spirit is overburdened by thoughts of the more awful verities of the faith, or weary with pondering the insoluble problems of man's origin and destiny, there is the same sort of relief in turning to this exquisite picture of the angels and the shepherds which a harebell, or a violet, or a delicate spray of fern, gives the eye, when one catches sight of it springing out of some mossy cleft in the rock at the foot of a great waterfall or on the face of a mountain steep. The cataract or the bluff has filled us with thoughts of our own utter insignificance, we feel cowed, dwarfed, dismayed; but the delicate pencilling of the flower reassures us. The same hand, we say, made both rock and leaf; the same Creator who seemed to frown on us from the greater work seems now to smile upon us in the lesser. In the Child of Bethlehem, Godhead and manhood meet and are knit together. "Is God, then, like this?" we ask, in pleased surprise. "Are the characteristics which so strongly attract us in the person of Jesus really a reflection of deity?" If so, the meeting him may turn out to be better than the meeting with one's dearest friend.

The Saviour of the world born a peasant's child, the King of men cradled in a manger—what satire is there here upon our cheap and vulgar notions of eminence, and yet what tenderness as well! What witness to the heavenly Father's pity for a world ruined by its own pride! What strong assurance that the words of the old prophet are to be fulfilled, and a Messiah born who shall truly bear our griefs and carry our sorrows!

Christmas is the smile on God's countenance; let us be glad and rejoice in it with the whole heart.

GRACE CHURCH RECTORY, New York City.

THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE UNION MOVEMENT.

BY B. B. TYLER.

It is profitable, now and again, to pause in any great reform and take the bearings; discovering, if possible, what progress has been made, and where we are.

In the beginning of the current movement in behalf of Christian union, it was necessary to show the sinfulness of sectarianism. This has been done. All who read the New Testament know that on its pages sectarianism is catalogued with "the works of the flesh." Sectarianism stands alongside of adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, envy, murder, drunkenness, and revelling. Sectarianism is a sin to be repented of as any other sin. Religious sectarianism is an offence to the Head of the Body. Those who are guilty of this sin shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

Sectarianism is not necessarily the same as denominationalism. The latter encourages the former, no doubt, but is not identical with it.

The several Protestant denominations represent so many efforts to return to the religion of Jesus, in whole or in part, as he gave it to the world in the beginning and as he would have had it continued to the end of time, after successive apostasies, either in faith or life, or in both.

Much has been gained by the fraternal discussions in which Christians have engaged in the past. An encouraging degree of progress has been made. Generally, now, the sin of sectarianism is confessed and some of the evils of our denominationalism are recognized. There are still, it is true, those who think that the division of believers into separate denominations, with conflicting creeds, and varying customs, and unlike organizations, is a good which may be permitted to continue.

But, believe me, denominationalism is temporary. The Christ did not intend his Church to be divided into denominations. He did not found them, He builded only his Church. Sooner or later this feature of the life of the Church must pass away. While

it is not of necessity sinful, as is sectarianism, it ought not to be regarded as the normal and permanent condition of the Church that Jesus saved and for which he gave his life.

But the present issue is concerning the basis of union. The sinfulness of sectarianism is realized and confessed. The desirability of denominationalism is, to say the least, doubted by many. The desirability of a clearer union among believers in Jesus than now exists is affirmed everywhere. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the present method of Sunday-school work, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Evangelical Alliance, the American Bible Society, the Christian Endeavor Society, etc., etc.—these testify, with one voice, to the desirability of a closer union among believers than exists at the present time. These organizations, also, by bringing Christians to work together, encourage the closer union, the desirability of which they confess.

But what basis of union will please Jesus? This is now the question.

The Church of Christ under the personal ministry of the Apostles was a unit. The believers in Jesus in the beginning were united. The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul. The unity of the disciples of Christ in that early period pleased Jesus. They occupied a platform that was acceptable to him. These propositions will not be controverted.

The creed of this United Church is plainly written in the New Testament. The creed of the reunited Church is ready made. We are under no necessity to make a creed. The creed of Christ's Church is divine. JESUS IS THE CHRIST THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. On this creed the Church in Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, rested. This was the creed of the Apostolic Church. It must be the creed of Christ's reunited Church.

The ordinances of Christ's Church are also presented in the New Testament. They are two—baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Church of Christ under the ministry of the Apostles had these ordinances, and these only. What is baptism? For whom is baptism? For what is baptism? What elements are used in the Lord's Supper? For whom is the Lord's Supper? How often ought the Lord's Supper to be observed? The purpose of the Lord's Supper? In a study of these Christian ordinances, these questions come to the

front; and they are answered in the New Testament.

What kind of a life would Jesus have each of his disciples live? This is an important question in considering the problem of Christian union. On this subject it is sufficient to say that Jesus is the standard. How did Jesus live? He left us an example. I ought to live every day like Jesus. There can be no *Christian* union while Christians are living unchristianly. And as Christians become more truly Christian, the problem before us will approach a solution. These points, then, are now before the minds of those who are working for the reunion of Christians:—I. The Creed. II. The Ordinances. III. The Life. Let us study the creed, the ordinances, and the life, necessary to Christian union as presented on the bright, clean pages of the New Testament.

NEW YORK.

DO OUR FOREIGN MISSIONARIES LIVE IN LUXURY?

BY REV. E. G. PORTER, D.D.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, November 20, 1890.

THE question has been raised by the critics. Let us meet it fairly, for there should be nothing to conceal, nothing to apologize for, in so great a work as the missionary enterprise to which the whole Christian church is committed by virtue of its charter.

1. The mode of life and methods of work now generally adopted by our missionaries in foreign lands are the result of a long and varied experience. Seventy-five years ago no one could tell how they would live, nor how they would work. It was enough that the men themselves were consecrated and trustworthy men. They were charged to take the Bread of Life to the perishing, and, in so doing, they were guaranteed a support, just what kind of a support could not then be determined. The church was willing to do its part, whatever it might be, and its messengers were willing to embark upon their holy errand in the spirit of absolute faith. It was natural that in the preliminary stages some experiments would prove unwise, through excess of zeal or neglect of proper precautions. Precious lives were, no doubt, sacrificed by needless exposure to the tropical sun, by the want of suitable food, by the absence of sanitary arrangements, or by an uninterrupted nervous strain which the conditions of life in the East do not permit.

2. This costly but valuable experience has

given us certain well-established data from which our boards have framed their instructions to the missionaries and estimated their ordinary expenses. The style of living is generally in accordance with those instructions and within the designated appropriations. And it is perfectly well known to all intelligent contributors, for it is described and illustrated, over and over again, in our missionary addresses and publications.

3. Whether or not their style of living should be called luxurious depends wholly upon our definition of that word, and upon other styles of living with which we compare it. Everything in such matters is relative. Compared with the natives in all Eastern countries, our missionaries do undoubtedly live in luxury. Compared with European and American merchants and officials in those countries, they do not. The casual observer might not distinguish between the British officer in India and the missionary. They both are well dressed, well housed and well fed. That is evident. But if you compare the expense of living, you will find that the former spends \$5000 or \$10,000 a year, and the latter, perhaps, \$1000. This is often overlooked.

4. Some unreasonable and unsympathetic travellers have reported that missionaries live like nabobs; keep servants, horses and carriages, and fare sumptuously every day, far better indeed than the average contributor to the Board, who ignorantly supposes that his missionary is undergoing the greatest privations all the time. The inference is that we must call for a reform, and order our agents to spend less money, to "live more like the people among whom they labor," and to make those commendable sacrifices which harmonize so well with the name of a missionary. Some critics in England are even demanding that celibacy should be required as being a less expensive and more efficient means of propagating the gospel.

5. Before joining in this cry, let us ourselves critically inspect our own well-tried and long-approved methods, and see whether reason or experience require any radical change to avoid the charge of luxury. That charge must relate to one or more of the following details, viz., the house the missionary lives in, the clothing he wears, the food he eats, the servants he employs, the conveyance he uses, the vacation he gets, or in general the married life which is permitted him. And, in the last analysis, the whole question, to a practical man, must turn upon the salary which is paid.

(1) We have always provided that the

missionary should have a decent house to live in. This we consider essential to his health, comfort and efficiency. But such a house as he needs puts him far above the Asiatic and the Polynesian. Do the critics know what they are saying, when they ask that our missionaries should "live as the natives do"? That means in a dingy, smoky hut, with a cow, donkey, fowls and vermin for domestic companions. How can the preacher of a pure religion, which requires that he keep himself "undefiled," conform to the filthy usages of Oriental natives? No, we send our representative to teach those poor people how to live as well as how to pray. We want to show them a Christian house as well as a Christian Bible. In fact, the Bible will soon create the house, if we do not. Such a house may be of any style you please, but it must have rooms adapted to the common necessities of eating, sleeping, bathing, studying, and perhaps teaching and preaching. It must have a thick roof to keep out the sun and rain; and, in hot countries, a wide veranda and spacious grounds, if possible, for air and shade trees and a few flowers, and very likely, also, for schools, hospitals or orphanage, all under the eye of the missionary, and enclosed by a suitable wall. You may take down your walls as much as you like in America, but you dare not do it in Turkey or China.

(2) We certainly want our missionaries to wear proper clothing. But if they lived "like the natives" they would often wear nothing but a waist-cloth and turban. Should we want them to do that? Are not personal cleanliness and self-respect a part of our religion, wherever we live? In truth, the matter of clothing seems more expensive than it really is in the East. Our missionaries often dress in white flannel which is very becoming and very cheap, and easily washed for a trifle. The cork or pith helmet is considered a great protection from the sun, and they all wear it just as other foreigners do. It may seem a luxury in the eyes of a cooley, but it is nothing more nor less than a necessity for the men of our race in that climate.

(3) The missionary is expected to provide an abundance of good and nourishing food for himself and his family. But this costs money. He cannot live on rice alone, and that often is so dear that millions of Hindoos and Chinamen cannot afford it and have to be content with cheaper grains like millet and sorghum. Many articles of food, such as our people require, have to be obtained from Europe or America. In a cer-

tain sense they are luxuries, just as tea and coffee and sugar are luxuries to us. Yet most civilized people call them necessities, and use them freely. Shall we grudge the missionary his American flour and butter, his Oregon salmon, and Chicago bacon if he craves them, as he certainly does when he is in a healthy working condition? His wife will probably have some delicacies, perhaps the gift of kind friends, reserved for some special occasion, like an annual meeting of the mission, or the visit of some stranger. How unkind, how unjust, in such a stranger to go away and report that the missionary lives luxuriously, has elegant table service, and rare dishes and many courses, when the fact is that the table at which he was a guest was furnished in quite an exceptional way, with those articles which had been carefully kept perhaps since the wedding-day in the dear home-land, and were brought out now as a mark of courtesy to the welcome visitor! Ordinarily the herald of the cross in those lands studies economy in his food as in everything else. He has to, and he wants to, as a matter of principle, wherever he might happen to live! But pray, let him not starve himself or his children. We never sent him out to do that. If we listened to the critics and required our brethren to avoid the appearance of luxury by adopting the native practice, let us see for a moment what such a menu would be: Bean-curd soup, rotten fish, boiled seaweed, fricassee de bow-wow, rissoles of donkey, and, in some missionary lands, lizards, snakes and maggots.

(4) As to servants. In order that the missionary and his wife may have as much of their time as possible to devote to the official work for which they were sent, we have always advised them not to burden themselves personally with the heavy work of housekeeping, but to employ native labor in the matter of cooking, washing, sweeping, stabling, etc., and when we know that servants can be had for ten, five and even three cents a day, and board themselves, we think we shall continue to give the same advice. Yet, it is said, many of our givers at home do their own work and could not afford to hire servants. Very likely. But that is not to the point. The question is not whether the missionary shall work hard, but what kind of work he shall do. Shall it be cooking food, or preaching the gospel? He cannot do both, which shall it be?

(5) As to equipage. Our missionaries generally have some kind of conveyance to ride in when they go on their preaching tours from village to village, and when they

inspect schools or visit the sick. These conveyances vary according to the locality. There are bullock-bandies, pony tongas, ekkas, gharries, saddle-horses, house boats, sedan-chairs, mule-litters and jin-riki-sha, to say nothing of camels and elephants. These may all be used without much expense, and they save our workers a great deal of strength which they need in their work. Does any one say that the missionary ought to go afoot? Let him try it first, and he will never say it again.

(6) As to vacations. Our Board has even been so indulgent as to provide summer resorts for its missionaries. They are encouraged at all our stations to get relief for body and mind by going to the hills in the unhealthy season. But this is a luxury, and many good people at home do not have vacations. The cases are not parallel. The missionary, be it remembered, lives in close contact with another and much lower type of civilization, which wearies and exhausts him beyond our conception, and he often lives in regions afflicted with heat and its accompaniments of fever, cholera, leprosy, and many other terrible diseases, against which he must be constantly on his guard and especially during the sickly period when thousands perish all about him. Shall he not take care of himself, then, and go with his family to some place of refuge for a few weeks and be safe? Who dares to say, No?

(7) There is no space left to speak of the advantages of married life in a foreign mission. We often send unmarried missionaries, but history shows that in the long run the most successful missionaries have been married. Converted natives are very emphatic in telling us that the missionary family life is a perpetual argument for Christianity among them, an object lesson of untold value.

(8) But, finally, the charge of luxury is already silenced when we announce the slender stipend upon which the missionary has to live. He cannot be extravagant on so meagre an allowance. It is simply impossible, and that ends the question.

LEXINGTON, MASS.

ENDEAVOR—WHAT?

BY REV. JOHN HALL, D.D., LL.D., PASTOR OF THE FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEW YORK.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston, November 27, 1890.

"CHRISTIAN Endeavor? endeavor what?"

"Why, endeavor to do right."

"To do right in what?"

"Right—well, of course everybody knows what's right," and the puzzled member tried to change the conversation. He had the best intentions, but he had not definite ideas that could be presented off-hand.

The suggestion of a few such ideas may help some reader, and attention is asked to them, for it is a pity to be silent when a reason is demanded for Christian action. The hint that the devil suggests in such a case is that the one questioned is in the movement because somebody managed it, but that he or she really knows nothing about it. Contempt, not respect, is the issue.

Now, young friends, endeavor to take care of your bodies. God made them; in a sense they are His. Treat them as His; do nothing that will injure them. Their health in the future will be a great element in your happiness. Do nothing with food, or delicacies, or amusements, or drink, or too late hours, or games, or sins that cannot be named, that will injure your bodies or expose them to injury. A soldier on the battle field has to go into peril; it is the duty of the hour. But you are not soldiers in this sense. Many a life is a failure because the members that ought to have been instruments of righteousness have been injured through thoughtlessness and sin.

Endeavor to take care of your minds. You have each a memory. Do not let any one, by spoken or printed words, put rubbish into it. You have an imagination. Do not let it be polluted by suggestions of evil. You have an understanding. Use it in its place; train it to raise and get answers to practical questions. "The fellows mostly do;" "the girls all say." Yes; is the thing they say or do right? Then get a standard of right. Did you ever see a practical carpenter when some question is raised about the length or breadth of something? He puts his hand in his pocket, brings out a rule, opens it and lays it along the board. "It is just eighteen inches and a half; there it is; see?" So he settles it. Friends of the Christian Endeavor, you know what the Rule is; train your understanding to use it. "Prove all things." You have conscience. When the understanding pronounces a thing right, conscience says, Do it. If you do, conscience gets confidence and speaks out the next time; if you do not, conscience falls into silence and waits until it can say—and often with a keen reproach—I told you so. Take care of your affections. Do not let them twine themselves about brambles. If you do, they will drag you down and you will be trampled upon some day. Set them on "things

above." What those are you can learn from the Rule. Have you a pocket Bible?

Take care of your home. There is father; you little know the cares he has in order to get you what he thinks you need. And mother—how much she has done, is doing for you! You can gladden, cheer and honor them, or you can break their hearts. There's brother—your own brother—how much you can strengthen and help him, over a hard lesson, in a little difficulty, perhaps, when he is tempted to do wrong, by a gentle word, not of lecturing or scolding or threatening, but of loving entreaty, "Don't, Charlie, dear; it's not good, and it will vex mother." Many a pure, true sister has saved her brother. He laughs a little, perhaps, when she is advising or beseeching him—quizzes her, perhaps—but he says to himself afterward, "Well, I'd like—but Janey's a good girl, and it would trouble her. I guess I'll not." What would you think of any one who took lodgings with a family and brought in a patient with small-pox? Keep all contagion, all infection, all seeds of evil, out of your home. You know the hymn that so many will sing on Thanksgiving Day. Here is a poor parody of it, which perhaps you will remember:

My home, it is of thee,
Where all are good to me,
Of thee I sing:
Home of my father's cares,
Home of my mother's prayers,
O God, through all the years
Thy blessing bring!

Take care of your influence. Let it be for good only. Even an innocent thing to you may look bad to a younger or less instructed one than you. Then keep away from it. Do not copy him who began with, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and ended a murderer of his brother. Rather, try to be a blessing. You know how people put at the end of a notice "N. B."—*nota bene*—a little bit of Latin that we have adopted, meaning, *Mark well; don't forget*. Well, there is an N. B. in the Bible: "But to do good and to communicate"—now comes the N. B.—"forget not." Look at it in Heb. 13:16. Why should we thus endeavor? Mainly because we trust Jesus Christ, who died for us in love, and we love Him for it. In Him we are taken into the family of His Father, who gave Him for us in love, and we love Him. Through Christ, the Holy Spirit comes and lives in us, not in spite of ourselves, but at our earnest request, and we would not grieve Him; no, we would fain make our lives a reverent doxology "to the glory of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

IV.

THE FREE CHURCH SYSTEM SUPPORTED BY PLEDGES.

BY THE REV. GEORGE WOOLSEY HODGE, M.A.,
RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE ASCENSION, PHILADELPHIA; FORMERLY SECRETARY, AND NOW MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE FREE AND OPEN CHURCH ASSOCIATION, ETC.

THE position which is maintained in this article, of the propriety and expediency of providing for the support of churches by means of voluntary pledges, is based on the supposition of the necessity of the seats in churches being free. If it were not for this necessity, we should be quite willing to admit that the sale and rental of pews might be a most convenient and efficient mode of securing a revenue, just as fairs, raffles, and lotteries are easy means of raising money. But the question is not simply how to secure most readily and regularly the largest income, for if it were there would be no objection to using any of the above methods.

The first question for the Church is, how best to accomplish the one great purpose for which it exists, that of carrying the Gospel to all creatures, how to reach and hold and minister to the largest number of souls. The question of Church Support must be subsidiary to that. And any method of securing that support which in any degree interferes with that primary purpose of the church, or throws any bar or hindrance in the way of accomplishing its spiritual work, should not be tolerated for an instant, no matter how easy or efficacious it may be. And unless the Church's doors are thrown wide open and the fullest and the freest invitation is given to every one to enter them, unless men are made to feel that a church is a place where every one, no matter what may be his worldly circumstances or ability, has a right and welcome, and where it is his duty to be, we do not believe the Church can ever fulfil its mission of reaching all classes and conditions of men. We believe that the not adhering to this principle in the past has resulted in the alienation of the masses from the Church; in creating

the impression that the Church is only for the well-to-do, who can afford it, or for the absolutely pauper class, who are content to be dependent upon the alms of the rich; in the cultivation of habits of non-church-going even among multitudes of professedly religious people, owing to the difficulty they experience and the uncomfortable feeling they have in going to any church in which they cannot afford, or it is not convenient for them, to rent a pew; and in making it morally impossible to attract and hold the vast number of persons who are careless and indifferent about religious things. On these grounds and others which we will not stop to enumerate, we hold that it is absolutely essential, if the Church is to have any higher ambition, or do any larger work, than that of simply ministering to a comparatively few well-to-do people, already piously inclined, who club together to maintain its ministrations, that its seats should be always and everywhere free.

This being assumed, we maintain that the wisest and best method of supporting churches under this system is that of asking from the regular attendants, or those interested in them, pledges or subscriptions to be paid yearly, quarterly, monthly, or weekly, as may be most convenient or agreeable, and at the same time giving constant opportunities for the reception of unpledged offerings.

There is not the slightest inconsistency in this with the free system, because it in nowise interferes with the freedom of the seats, no one is obliged to make such a pledge if he does not wish, or is unable, to do so, nor is his going to the church or enjoyment of its ministrations at all dependent upon the amount of his pledge, or upon whether he gives anything at all.

The advantages of this system are that while it secures the freedom of the seats (1), it provides a stated and regular revenue upon which the church officers can depend, and upon which they can base their expenditures. (2) It does not make the income dependent upon the attendance at a particular service or season of the year, the pledges running over the whole year. (3) It teaches people to fix upon a definite sum which they ought to give. (4) It secures the amount thus determined on being paid at one time if not at another. (5) It does not make the position one occupies in church, or his reception of its benefits, proportioned to his financial ability, but makes the amount he gives dependent solely upon the size of his income and his willingness to devote it to religious purposes, so that the one

who can give only a little is precisely in the same position in the church as the person who can give largely. (6) It enables the offerings to be made secretly, that which the poor and the rich give looking exactly alike if enclosed in envelopes. (7) It saves the self-respect of the poor and those in moderate circumstances by making them feel that they are not receiving their religious privileges for nothing, but share in the support of the church, even though the amount they contribute be small. (8) It gives every one attending the church, not only the rich, or the heads of families, but each one, a sense of responsibility of bearing a share in its support. (9) It cultivates the habit of systematic giving, and teaches the supreme duty of setting aside a fixed definite proportion of one's income for religious purposes. (10) It makes giving dependent not upon impulse or emotion, or upon receiving a *quid pro quo* for the amount given, but upon intelligent, conscientious, and business principles. (11) It puts what one gives to the church in the light of an offering and act of worship, the token and pledge of the reality of his convictions and earnestness of his religious life, and not simply as the payment of an obligation for a convenience received. (12) It makes it easier to give in small sums than it would be to give a large sum at one time.

There is, therefore, a vast difference both in principle and in its effects, between renting the seats in churches and asking the pledge of a fixed sum for their support. And for the reasons we have given it seems to us that the pledge system is much superior to all others. It combines all the advantages of the free church with those of the pew system, without the enormous disadvantages attendant upon the latter. And it is better than depending merely upon unpledged offerings, as it secures a regular income, and system and conscientiousness in giving.

In practical experience it has so commended itself to the genius of our American people that it has already become the most prevalent mode of church support. And we believe that as Christian people come more and more to realize the great mission and purpose of the church, and willing to subordinate their own ease and comfort to its accomplishment, it is destined to become universal.

THE MONTH'S MIND.

NEW YORK awoke the other day to the luxury of a new sensation. A man of whom few had

heard, outside of a narrow business circle, was found to have bequeathed something like \$3,000,000, most of it to charitable and educational institutions. Various hospitals in the city received sums aggregating \$95,000, and bequests were made to twenty-one different colleges and universities in all parts of the country, amounting to more than \$2,000,000. The peculiarity of the case consisted less in the largeness of the sum given away—although there have been but two or three instances of larger gifts in this country—than in the fact that the donor had no public repute either as a rich man or as a liberal man. Among the few who knew him well he was known to be a man of means, but even they did not suspect the extent of his fortune. He was also known by his more intimate friends to be a generous, though always an unostentatious giver. Posthumous benevolence is less entitled to respect and gratitude than any other kind. The man who makes a virtue of necessity, and gives away his money when he can neither use it himself nor take it with him, is certainly less worthy of respect and grateful remembrance than the man who gives away a fortune during his own lifetime. The greater part of posthumous benevolence also loses title to any special respect by reason of its ostentation and selfishness. Men leave large sums to found institutions merely that their own names and memories may be perpetuated. The striking quality of Mr. Fayerweather's benevolence was this lack of ostentation. Instead of founding a new college to bear his name, or even chairs and scholarships to bear his name in connection with established colleges, he has made unconditional bequests of from \$50,000 to \$100,000 each to institutions already founded and in more or less flourishing condition. This method of disposing of his fortune has not only the merit of novelty, but in the end it will doubtless accomplish more good than if it had all been bestowed in the usual manner. Indeed, the good sense of Mr. Fayerweather cannot be too much commended, and his example, it is to be hoped, will be imitated by many other rich men who are contemplating large bequests. We have already a surplus of colleges and so called universities. We need fewer rather than more. But though the world would willingly let many of them die, each existing institution has its warm friends, who will do everything in their power to prevent a consummation so devoutly to be wished. The only practical policy is, therefore, to strengthen the institutions that we now have, and by all practicable means to create a public opinion opposed to the founding of other institutions. If all the bequests that have been devoted during the past generation to the founding of new and struggling colleges as monuments to rich men had been devoted to the fitting endowment of existing institutions, the cause of education in this country would have been greatly advanced. In saying this we do not, of course, refer to the one or two exceptional cases like the Johns Hopkins University, where some man has left a sufficient sum to found, equip and thoroughly endow a college that fills a place hitherto occupied by none. The cases to which we refer have been more common in the South and West, perhaps, than in the East, where the cost of founding a college is better appreciated. But in some sections of our country the idea prevails that \$50,000 or \$100,000 is a very liberal sum with which to set a college going. The latest of the new institutions (which is, strictly speaking, not so much a new one as a continuation of a work begun thirty years ago and suffered by bad management to fail), the University of Chicago, will begin its career with property and endowments

worth fully \$2,500,000, and it is not at all improbable that a few years will see this amount doubled.

* * *

For a few days it seemed probable that New York would enjoy a second new sensation, nothing less than the probate of this remarkable will, and the settlement of the estate without a legal contest. It seemed too good to be true when we read in the papers that all the heirs were satisfied, and had joined in the petition that the will be admitted to probate. It was too good to be true, or, perhaps one should say, to remain true. The widow of Mr. Fayerweather has decided to contest the will, on the ground, it is reported, of undue influence. The evidence of this undue influence is supposed to be found in codicils to the original will that make the executors residuary legatees. The fortune of the testator has so increased since the will was drawn, that from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 are likely to remain after all the specific bequests have been paid. It is represented that Mrs. Fayerweather and the other heirs do not object to the bequests to hospitals and colleges, but question the equity of the codicils. There appears to be force in this objection, but an explanation has been offered that puts the matter in a new light. The original will made the colleges the residuary legatees, leaving the division of the residuary estate to the discretion of the executors; but the contest over the late Samuel J. Tilden's will made Mr. Fayerweather fear that the courts might pronounce so indefinite a bequest invalid. Accordingly, he is said to have adopted the expedient of bequeathing the residuary estate absolutely to his executors, leaving them an expression of his wishes that he could trust them to carry out. The result, it is said, if the will is sustained will be that a college to which \$100,000 is definitely bequeathed will also receive from the residuary estate an additional \$150,000. In other words, the bequest is in fact, though not in form, a bequest in trust. A formal bequest in trust would have been of doubtful legality, but in this way Mr. Fayerweather hoped to carry out his plans in a manner unquestionably legal. If this be a true statement of his plan and the intent of his executors, it will be seen that Mrs. Fayerweather, whatever she may intend or protest, in contesting the will is really striving to bring to naught one of the largest schemes of beneficence ever conceived by an American. It would be deplorable if the technicalities of law should stand in the way of realizing so grand a plan. Many of the attempts to "break" wills, so common of late years, have been marked by cynical immorality, but the breaking of this will would be more than a private wrong, it would take on the proportions of a public calamity.

* * *

THIS case adds another to the numerous object lessons of man's duty to be his own executor. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is credited with the saying that it is a disgrace to a man to die rich, but it is a disgrace that most men would willingly incur. It is a disgrace, however, or if not a disgrace, an exhibition of folly, for a man who has money to give for benevolent objects and the disposition to give it, to leave the matter to such uncertainties as the disposition of greedy heirs and the subtleties of legal interpretation. When Mr. Fayerweather found, from the case of Mr. Tilden, that his will was of uncertain validity, why did not so shrewd a man of business resolve to settle all legal quibbles out of hand by becoming his own executor? By neglecting to take this course he missed some of the hap-

piest experiences a rich man can have, the actual vision of the good being accomplished by the millions he has toiled with so much self-denial and persistence to accumulate. He not only missed this joy, which would have brought real light and gladness into the closing years of his life, but the institutions he might have aided have lost the counsel of a man so well fitted to aid them in wisely bestowing his bounty. Worse than all, he risked the complete wreck of his plan, the frustration of all his hopes. Even if the will finally stands, the public will be sickened with a deluge of scandal about a man of whose failings it would choose to know nothing in its high appreciation of his virtues. Does not the whole case strongly emphasize the words of him who wrote this golden sentiment: "I shall pass through this world but once. Any good thing, therefore, that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

* * *

It is too soon to say whether "the mission" begun in this city by Father Ignatius will create as great a ferment in New York as it did in Boston. In Boston the Father began with the great advantage of apparent martyrdom. It was martyrdom on a very small scale, to be sure, but enough to answer the purpose of an excellent advertisement. The fact is that Father Ignatius is a monk of the order of St. Benedict, he having revived an ancient monastic order of the Church of England. He proclaims himself an English Catholic, and repudiates Protestantism. He received orders as a deacon a number of years ago, but has never been ordained to the priesthood in the Anglican Church. His monastery is an independent organization that has no standing or recognition in the Church of England. Coming to this country, he is required by the canon law to obtain a license to preach from the bishop of a diocese before he can preach in any of its churches. Bishop Paddock, of Massachusetts, thought the above facts were a sufficient reason why a license to preach in his diocese should be refused, and therefore Father Ignatius was obliged to preach in halls and in various Protestant churches that were offered to him for the purpose. Bishop Potter, of New York, though not specially enamored of the man or his methods, has given him a license to preach, and he has preached in some of the metropolitan churches, though he seems to prefer holding forth in the public halls. The general character of his preaching is not unfairly described if we compare it to that of the old-fashioned Methodist revivalist. It is sensational in the extreme. It is also picturesque, exciting, and comparatively novel—so old, that is to say, that it is new. Father Ignatius himself is tonsured like any Roman monk, and he wears the serge gown, hempen girdle, and sandals of the Roman monk. His preaching consists largely of denunciations of worldly Christianity. Its staple is an appeal to the feelings; he decries reason and exalts the emotional element of Christianity; he advises and commends an ascetic type of piety. For the time being preaching like this will, of course, create a considerable furor. The extent and wholesomeness of its influence will remain to be estimated hereafter.

* * *

THE Protestant Episcopal Church, considering its wealth and culture, has never had an adequate representation among the educational institutions of our country. With the exception of Columbia,

none of the colleges under the control of Episcopalians have been equal in size, endowment, and scholarship to those established by other religious bodies. This somewhat remarkable fact is probably to be explained by the neglect of the Church hitherto in providing for systematic beneficence for educational purposes or official supervision of the work. The gifts made have been made by individuals from their own sense of duty to God and man, and many of the gifts of Episcopalians have not gone to institutions controlled by their own Church. The need of ecclesiastical supervision has been felt in this Church for some time past, and within a few weeks a body has been organized, known as the Church University Board of Regents, which practically corresponds to the education societies that have been established and maintained by the Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists. The founding of schools and colleges will no longer go on at haphazard, and opportunities of planting schools in strategic points will not be missed hereafter for the lack of means and foresight. This Board of Regents will have as one of its functions to decide where new schools should be established, and how far existing institutions are deserving of aid. The approval of the Board will be a necessary preliminary to the raising of funds, and it is altogether probable that the Regents will undertake in the course of time the raising of a large common endowment fund. The aim is, if we are correctly informed, in the end to consolidate all existing Episcopal institutions into one university under the control of this Board of Regents. This is a large scheme, but if successfully carried out, the results could not well fail to be most gratifying.

ONE of the marvels in the history of the Christian church is the rapid growth of the organization known as the King's Daughters. Beginning in this city a few years ago with a membership of ten consecrated women, it has enlarged its bounds until its members are found in every State of the Union. At a recent session of the order in this city a membership of over 160,000 was represented. No organization for Christian service has been superior to this in arousing enthusiasm and promoting personal piety. Its rapid growth can only be accounted for upon the hypothesis that an organization of this kind was especially suited to the wants of the day. Its strong points have been two: First, it did not attempt any specific Christian work, but sought rather the development of a spirit of consecration, leaving the form in which this should express itself to the individual conscience and the providence of God; and, secondly, it has been from the first entirely unsectarian, requiring no pledge of membership beyond simple loyalty to the King. Any one who was willing to accept Jesus as Lord was eligible to membership in the order. The breadth of this principle has led to some complications that are much to be regretted, though it has no doubt been one of the chief causes of the order's rapid growth. Of course, it is inevitable that any organization that increases in numbers so rapidly as this should to some extent deteriorate, for it is impossible that many should not be drawn into the movement who have no deep sympathy with its spirit and objects. Nevertheless, the King's Daughters have been a great power for good, and no one who knows what they have done or has any conception of the possibilities of their work in the future can speak any word save a God-speed.

CHURCH union is certainly the topic of the day.

It is a question whether this is due to the sentimental attraction of the theme—and, in the case of many Christians, religion chiefly appeals to the emotions—or whether Americans are like the Athenians in Paul's day, and do nothing but hear or tell of some new thing. What is not in question is the interest at present taken in the subject. Within the last month a number of religious bodies have discussed the subject at length and from various points of view. At a public meeting of Presbyterians in the Metropolitan Opera House, Mr. William E. Dodge, one of the best known and most influential laymen in that communion, spoke of the necessity of united Christian effort in behalf of the 600,000 to 700,000 people in New York who are practically unreached by the churches, and whose increasing numbers constitute a serious danger to society. He estimated that fully two fifths of the population are given over to infidelity and indifference to religion. The substantial accuracy of Mr. Dodge's statements will probably not be doubted by any. The question of remedy is, however, more difficult. The remedy that finds most favor among Presbyterians at present is a federation of the churches, by which the forces of the various religious bodies may be arrayed against the powers of evil and the effective working force may be wielded by one controlling agency. There is something about the largeness of this plan that will be captivating to many minds, but it would be wasting argument to prove that it is wholly incompatible with existing conditions. Anything properly deserving the name of federation is impossible unless the various denominations of Christians no longer sincerely believe their distinctive tenets and are willing to surrender their nominal faiths on demand. No one who has any considerable acquaintance with religious affairs believes this. It does not follow because polemics, whether in the pulpit or in the press, are somewhat less fashionable now than they were in a former generation, that beliefs are less tenaciously held. The various Christian bodies are learning more and more that it is possible to speak the truth in love to and about one another, and this is promoting a mildness and courtesy of speech that did not formerly prevail. But this by no means indicates that the dividing lines between sects are less sharply drawn, or would be less obstinately maintained on occasion than in former years. We have learned, and the world is to be congratulated that it is so, to put more stress on the things in which we agree than on the things about which we differ. But the differences are still there, and they are as great, as insurmountable as they ever were. The only sort of federation possible would be such a combination for certain limited charitable and philanthropic purposes as evangelical Christians have already made in various Bible societies, Christian associations, the Evangelical Alliance, and other familiar forms of Christian activity. Indeed, the word federation suggests so many ideas utterly repugnant to most Christian people, that its use in this connection cannot be regarded as anything but unfortunate in the extreme.

FORMER generations treated criminals with an undue and sometimes barbarous severity. The Draconian Code, which punished every manner of offence with death, was not much more severe than the law that prevailed in England until the present century, condemning to death every person who stole property to the value of more than five shillings. A great change has been wrought in the laws of Christendom during the last fifty years,

until we seem much inclined to go to the opposite extreme, and to regard crime and criminals with a mawkish sentimentalism. This tendency was well illustrated in the treatment that has lately been given to a criminal in one of our great cities. A member of a prominent church, active in Sunday-school work, he had for years been engaged in systematic forgeries, amounting in the aggregate to \$300,000. When his crime was detected, and he had brought ruin upon the partners who trusted him and disgrace upon his family and friends, and not till then, he professed sorrow and penitence for his misdeeds. Pleas for a light sentence were made in his behalf on the ground of his prominence in society, his hitherto unblemished reputation, his activity in Christian work, and the like. But it is gratifying to note that the judge was not imposed upon by this nonsense. On the contrary, he held that these facts added to the heinousness of the offence, and he therefore sentenced him to the full extent of the penalty prescribed by law. But the judge seems to have been the only one who has had any connection with the affair that has preserved his moral equilibrium. The convicted and disgraced forger sent a letter to the church of which he was a member professing "bitter sorrow and sincere repentance;" whereupon the church voted to "retain his name upon the rolls in the faith that no man more needs the watch and care of a Christian church than one who has fallen into sin but has sincerely repented of his sin and desired to return to the way of righteousness and life."

* *

THE event of the month in the Church of England has been the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln for alleged ritualistic and uncanonical practices. This prosecution, which was begun more than a year ago, has caused great feeling among English Churchmen, and at one time threatened to result in open schism, or at least in an unseemly conflict. It is probable that the decision rendered by Archbishop Benson will allay the excitement and, for the present at least, prevent further divisions. The decision is remarkable for its moderation and impartiality. It will not entirely satisfy either party to the suit. It condemns some of the acts of Bishop King, as, for instance, his practice of standing with his back to the people during the prayer of consecration, so that the communicants could not see him break the bread and take the cup according to the direction of the rubric. Another point decided against the Bishop of Lincoln was with regard to the use of the mixed chalice. It was shown that while the mixing of water and wine in the communion cup was a custom of long standing in the church and therefore not illegal, the mixing of water and wine as part of the service is contrary to the law of England. The curious nature of some of the decisions contained in the archbishop's judgment is due to the fact that he was constrained to abide by the letter of the law, and the law regulating the usages of the Established Church in England is a series of compromises, without consistency, in this part lending support to one doctrine and practice, and in another part as distinctly approving an opposed doctrine or practice. On account of these inconsistencies a man holding almost any variety of theology and advocating almost any form of worship can find something somewhere in the law that will sustain him, at least in part. It is this sense of uncertainty and conflict in the law that has given so great an impulse dur-

ing the last few years in the Church itself toward disestablishment.

* *

THE Conference for Bible Study recently held in Brooklyn was hardly described, as to its real objects, by its chosen title. It should have been called "a conference of those who believe in the premillennial coming of Christ." It is true that the invitation to the Christian public was general, but it is also true that those who took a prominent part in the proceedings were believers in the premillennial doctrine. They did not lack the courage of their convictions or the gift of utterance. One of the most distinguished speakers declared that the great majority of biblical scholars support the premillennial theory; that the majority is so great it may be said to amount to a consensus, at least nine tenths of the scholars of the present day holding this view. Another speaker (in what, for charity's sake, one hopes was a state of abnormal excitement) denounced those who believe in "the infernal doctrine of the conversion of the world before the coming of Christ." Father Ignatius, it may be fair to remark here, also holds that Christianity was not intended to convert the world, but cherishes the blessed hope that the world is to grow worse and worse until the appearing of our Lord. It is somewhat remarkable that men with reputations to lose should be willing to make in public statements like these, and that there are such men is one of the significant facts in current religious history.

* *

Few propositions could be made that would more quickly touch a responsive chord in the hearts of New York Christians than the suggestion to erect a monument to the memory of the late Charles Loring Brace. It is true there have not been wanting some grumbling disciples to say, "Why all this waste?" but there will be few to think the cost of such a memorial ill spent. Mr. Brace has already one monument in New York that would be an honor to any man in the Children's Aid Society. This beneficent and many-sided work was placed by him on enduring foundations. During the past year it has maintained five lodging-houses for boys and one for girls, in which lodging and meals are provided at a merely nominal price. Besides, it has carried on twenty-one industrial schools and twelve night schools, in which not only elementary education but manual training is given. But, after all, the greatest good accomplished by this society has consisted in the establishment of the waifs and strays of our city in country homes, where they have been removed from the temptations of city life and have been given an opportunity to become useful men and women. During the history of the society more than 75,000 have been so cared for. Of course, there have been some failures, but they have been relatively few, and a large proportion of the boys and girls who have thus been saved from poverty and crime in this city are now well-to-do and respected members of society. It is worth noting that this is the precise way in which General Booth expects to accomplish most for the building up of character "in darkest England." He proposes to establish colonies in rural districts of England and in various parts of the world, to which men and women who have "fallen overboard" shall be sent and given a new opportunity to redeem themselves. The Children's Aid Society has the double advantage of beginning this work at the beginning, taking the tramp and criminal before he

has become such, while childhood still offers a plastic character to work upon. It proceeds upon the theory that formation is better than reformation, less costly to society, and more certain in its results. That the man who founded this work and so many years successfully carried it on deserves a permanent memorial from the people whom he served so long and faithfully it needs no argument to prove.

* * *

A LIBERAL CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE has been organized in Chicago by a convention representing so-called liberal Christians in all parts of the country. This new alliance avows as its object the promotion of a better and more spiritual interpretation of Christianity and of fellowship in spirit and work among liberal Christians. It is distinctly provided in the constitution that the alliance shall in no way disturb either the independence or the denominational relations of members. Professor David Swing, who is the president of the new organization, is said to have explained to a reporter that the body is "primarily a social club composed of persons having certain aims in common." The word Christian, he added, is used "in its broadest sense as a philosophical, not as a theological term, to include all who believe in Christ as the source from which emanate all good works." Liberal Christians, so called, are, as a rule, not gregarious. The principle of individualism is too strong for continued united action, and it is not likely that this new alliance will be a long lived or influential body.

* * *

AN interesting question is now being decided in the Methodist Episcopal Church, it being a proposed modification of the constitution of the body, so as to admit women as lay delegates to the General Conference. The women seem likely to win in this contest, for a contest it has become, waged with much vigor and some bitterness on both sides. At present the total vote stands: affirmative, 8497; against, 9507—a majority of over a thousand against the change. The decision, however, is not by plebiscite, but by the vote of the churches, the majority in each church deciding the vote of that body. It is possible, therefore, as in a Presidential election, for a minority on the total vote to get a majority of the churches, and there are indications that this may be the result. What is a much graver thing than this possible change in the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church is the means by which it has been urged. There has never been a case, in the history of any modern religious body, that professed respect for the Scriptures, of more flagrant disregard of scriptural teaching. Those who opposed the change laid great stress on the declarations of Paul concerning the place of woman in the church—an honorable place, a place suitable to her special endowments, but not a place of teaching or exercising authority. The advocates of woman's admission to the General Conference have attempted no answer to this apparently decisive objection. In great part they have contemptuously ignored it, making much of woman's alleged "equality" with man, uttering impassioned appeals for emancipation and justice. When they have condescended to notice the scriptural objections to their proposed amendment, they have met it in a way that implies total disbelief in the divine inspiration and permanent authority of Paul's writings—at least of the part of those writings that discusses woman's position in the church. They did not attempt any exegesis of the New Testament that would bring it into harmony with their position—that they prob-

ably felt to be a hopeless task, as Paul's meaning is quite too clear to be explained away. No; they adopted the simpler course of blotting out of their Bibles, so far as their own belief or obedience is concerned, all that did not suit their ideas of what the Scriptures should say. We need hardly point out that this is the most dangerous kind of infidelity, the kind that professes belief yet cherishes a secret notion (which on occasion is expressed) that, as Mr. Lowell has it, "They didn't know everything down in Judee." It is the sort of infidelity that led a noted preacher to declare he would disbelieve the divinity of Christ, if he were convinced that our Lord made intoxicating wine at Cana of Galilee. It is the infidelity that really believes in nothing but itself, that doubts even God if He presumes to be or do other than what these wise people have decided that He must be and do. It does not come with its ideas to the Scriptures to find if its conception of the truth be correct: it brings the Scriptures into judgment by the light of its ideas, and rejects what will not endure this test. This infidelity many call faith. It may be faith, but it is not faith in God or in His Word.

PARAGRAPHIC.

ACCORDING to a correspondent in *Notes and Queries*, there is "rank confusion" in episcopal signatures. Thus Mr. Edward Walford points out that even during the present century one bishop of St. Asaph wrote "W. Asaphens," his successor "W. St. Asaph;" one bishop of Chester wrote "W. Chester," and another "W. Cestr.;" one bishop of Oxford wrote "K. Oxford," and the next signed his name "S. Oxon.;" Bishop Phillips wrote "H. Exeter," but his successor, Dr. Temple, "F. Exon." and he now writes "F. London," his predecessors having always written "C. L. London," "W. London," etc. A hundred years ago Dr. Thurlow, Bishop of Durham, signed "T. Duresme," but his successors have always written "W. Dunelm."—*Southern Churchman*.

A WOMAN in Philadelphia, left a widow, was obliged to support her family, and she now makes quite a snug little sum in this way: She is a perambulating housekeeper, and has a dozen or more clients on her list, as many in fact as she can comfortably serve. She goes from house to house, making weekly visits, and serving two and sometimes more of her customers in one day. Her duties are inspectorial and directorial. She goes over a house from cellar to garret, looks after the linen, furniture, decorations, and has authority to give directions to the servants or resident housekeeper. She prepares a daily menu a week ahead, audits the accounts of tradesmen and very often has the entire supervision over dinner parties and receptions. No detail in the management of a household escapes her.—*Southern Churchman*.

COLONEL INGERSOLL, some years ago, assumed the prophet's rôle, and foretold the decay of Christianity. The following characteristic communication from Chaplain McCabe was lately sent to him: "Time is up, Robert. Chaplain McCabe's message to Colonel Ingersoll: Dear Colonel: Ten years ago you made the following prediction: 'Ten years from this time two theatres will be built for one church.' The time is up. The Methodists are now building four churches every day—one every six hours. Please venture upon another prediction for the year 1900."—*Christian Herald*.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE FATHER OF CHURCH HISTORY IN A NEW ENGLISH DRESS.*

By PHILIP SCHAFF.

It is not too much to say that the first volume of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library* is the most important original contribution which America has made to patristic learning. If we except a few monographs on the recently discovered "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," American literature is barren in this important department of Church history. The Church of England has well-nigh monopolized the study of the Fathers among Protestant denominations, and has recently produced a monumental work on patristics, the like of which even the Greek and Roman Church, or German scholarship, cannot boast of. We mean, of course, the "Dictionary of Christian Biography" of the first eight centuries, edited by Dr. Wace, Principal of King's College, London, who has recently been selected by the senior editor as co-editor of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library*. Among the many contributors to the four stately volumes of this Dictionary there is only one American contributor, and he not an Episcopalian. The edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," by the late Bishop Lightfoot, of Durham, must also be mentioned as a work of the highest and broadest scholarship, which is superior to all other editions. "The Oxford Library of the Fathers" is exclusively the work of English Episcopals, and "The Ante-Nicene Library" of Roberts and Donaldson (republished by Bishop Cox, with valuable additions) is the joint product of English and Scotch scholars.

But if the book we are now reviewing may be taken as a fair sign of the times, we have good reason to expect at no very distant future a rich harvest from the rising generation of American Church historians.

It is right and proper that in this American revival of the study of Church history we should begin at the foundations. The famous work of Eusebius covers the first three centuries to the time of the great change marked by the appearance of the great Constantine. No matter what view we take of the ability and trustworthiness of the author, his work will always be consulted as the chief authority on the history of the ante-Nicene age, because he is the father of Church history, as Herodotus is the father of secular history, and because he has made industrious use of all the sources then accessible, some of which have been lost in

whole or in part. His history, therefore, has itself to a large extent the character and value of a primary source.

Eusebius has been several times translated and edited in English. The last translation prior to that of Dr. McGiffert was made by an American Episcopalian, Dr. Crasé, of New York. It is reprinted in Bohn's Library and in the Bagster edition of the Greek historians, which includes also Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret and Evagrius. But it is no more than a translation with a brief biographical introduction and a few scattered notes. And the translation itself is rather loose and often inaccurate.

Dr. McGiffert leaves all the previous editions of Eusebius at a respectful distance. He furnishes not only a new translation more faithful and idiomatic than the former ones, but a complete introduction of seventy-two double column pages on the life and works of Eusebius, and in foot-notes a running commentary, which occupies nearly as much space and more matter in small type than the text itself. His Eusebius is in fact, though not in form, a critical history of the first three centuries with the light that modern research and learning, Catholic and Protestant, German and English, has spread over it. In these notes Dr. McGiffert gives evidence that he has mastered the numerous recent investigations concerning the post-apostolic literature, the Apologists, the ancient heresies, the martyrology, the canon, and other important phenomena of the second and third centuries. It is well known to scholars that not a few documents of great importance relating to that period have been discovered within the last thirty years, such as the Codex Sinaiticus of the Greek Bible, the Greek Barnabas, the Greek Pastor of Hermas, the Syriac Ignatius, the Tenth Book of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, the Philosophumena of Hippolytus, fragments of Aristides and Miltiades, a new and complete manuscript of the First and Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, Tatian's Diatessaron, and last, though not least, the Didache of the Twelve Apostles. They have given rise to a large literature so that even the three great master works of ancient Church history by Neander, Gieseler and Baur are left behind, and are almost superseded, as far as the second century is concerned, because they were ignorant of these new discoveries. Dr. McGiffert had the advantage over them and has made conscientious use of his facilities. He has devoted four or five years to the task. His work is up to the latest date of German, English and American scholarship, and indispensable to the student of ante-Nicene Church history.

The work is too recent to have been publicly noticed in foreign periodicals; but I have received favorable judgments of competent German critics, as Professor Harnack, of Berlin, and Professor Holtzmann, of Strassburg. German scholars rarely get to see American books, unless they are sent to them by the authors or friends, and if they do, they are seldom able to read them with ease and comfort. While all German works of any importance are exported to America, and promptly bought by our scholars and institutions, the exportation of American theological works to Germany has not even begun, because there is no such demand for them as would justify the trouble and expense. But Drs. Harnack and Holtzmann read English with ease, and it may not be out of place to quote, in conclusion, an extract from a private letter of Dr. Holtzmann, which confirms all I said in favor of this noble monument of American patristic scholarship:

"On my return from vacation I find on my desk McGiffert's Eusebius translation. I could at once

* A SELECT LIBRARY OF NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Second Series. Translated into English with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes under the Editorial Supervision of Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, and Henry Wace, D.D., Principal of King's College, London. In connection with a number of Patristic scholars of Europe and America.

VOL. I. THE CHURCH HISTORY OF EUSEBIUS. Translated with Prolegomena and Notes by the Rev. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph.D., Professor of Church History in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati; THE LIFE OF CONSTANTINE, by Eusebius, together with the ORATION OF CONSTANTINE TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE SAINTS, and the ORATION OF EUSEBIUS IN PRAISE OF CONSTANTINE. A Revised Translation, with Prolegomena and Notes by Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D., Librarian and Associate Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary (now Librarian, College of New Jersey). New York: Christian Literature Company (35 Bond Street), 1890. 632 pp., \$3.00.

test and make use of it in many ways, and convince myself that it is an excellent means for easy orientation. The notes are very helpful and really constitute an admirable commentary. Here and there a German theologian will find something to supplement, especially as regards the latest literature. But even in this respect much more has been accomplished than I expected. I know no work ever published in Germany that is at once so rich and handy (*so reichhaltig und handhablich*) and furnishes such agreeable and fruitful instruction as this edition of Eusebius."

We have no space to notice the second part of this volume which contains Eusebius's Life of Constantine, his oration in praise of Constantine, and Constantine's Oration to the Assembly of the Saints, and which were prepared by Dr. Ernest Cushing Richardson (now librarian of Princeton College), except to say that the editor has done his work with conscientious care and furnished a more complete and accurate introduction and bibliography than can be found in any previous edition.

Altogether this stately volume of 632 royal octavo pages is the best beginning of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library*, and guarantees its ultimate success if the twelve or thirteen volumes which are to follow shall give evidence of equal ability and scholarship.

Union Theological Seminary.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. I., The Synoptic Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of Peter, James and Jude. Vol. II., The Writings of John: the Gospel, the Epistles, the Apocalypse. Vol. III., The Epistles of Paul: Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887-90. 3 vols., 8vo, pp. xxiv., 822; vii., 607; xli., 565, \$12.

Those who believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures must hold that the more exactly we get at the meaning of those Scriptures, the more clearly we understand the mind of God. Necessarily, then, the study of the letter is the foundation of spiritual knowledge. The assertion of this necessity is not impugned by the fact that spiritual knowledge should be emphasized as our aim, but is the rather strengthened thereby. Carelessness regarding the letter is really carelessness regarding the spirit.

To this examination of the letter of the Scriptures must come an impartial, judicial mind and a broad erudition. The imagination must be subject to the control of facts. Enthusiasm and prejudice have no place as guides. A logical treatment that uses a fair induction is demanded in the interest of truth. A thorough knowledge of the original language in which the Scriptures are written is an absolute necessity for their prime examiner. Others may take the result of his work, and, giving it all the confidence it deserves, build upon it, although they be ignorant of the original language. The linguistic examiner must not only know the original language, but he must know it so broadly as to compare its dialects and varieties of expression, its differing usages of the same forms, its idiomatic changes and its many styles. Hence he must know the literature of the language, and feel at home in handling it.

These qualities for a trustworthy guide in the examination of the Scriptures are not combined in

very many. Where we find them we should prize them and the results of their labors. Dr. Marvin R. Vincent, of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, has published three volumes of "Word Studies in the New Testament," in which have been used the qualities which we have described above. The last of the three volumes, containing the Epistles of Paul, has been issued this year (1890) by the publishing house of Charles Scribner's Sons.

His plan has been, as the name of the book implies, to take up every word that could be elucidated, and from etymology or usage or allusion to give the word and its context their full power before the reader's mind. In this his erudition has used the becoming patience of research, exactness of statement, and carefulness of reasoning which mark the complete scholar. The notes naturally vary in length. Of the longer notes we give a fair specimen, in which is most lucidly and admirably explained the meaning of the important word *voûs*, which is translated in our received version seven times as "understanding" and seventeen times as "mind."

"THE LAW OF MY MIND, Rom. vii. 23 (*τὸ νόμον τοῦ νοûς μου*). *Noûs*, *mind*, is a term distinctively characteristic of Paul, though not confined to him. (See Luke xxiv. 45; Apoc. xiii. 18; xvii. 9.) Paul's usage of this term is not based, like that of *spirit* and *flesh*, on the Septuagint, though the word occurs six times as the rendering of *lebb*, *heart*, and once of *ruach*, *spirit*. He uses it to throw into sharper relief the function of *reflective intelligence* and *moral judgment*, which is expressed generally by *kardia*, *heart*. The key to its Pauline usage is furnished by the contrast in 1 Cor. xiv. 14-19, between speaking with a *tongue* and with the *understanding* (*τὸ νοῦν*), and between the *spirit* and the *understanding* (ver. 14). There it is the faculty of reflective intelligence which receives and is wrought upon by the Spirit. It is associated with *γνώμη*, *opinion*, resulting from its exercise, in 1 Cor. i. 10; and with *κρίσις*, *judgment*, in Rom. xiv. 5. Paul uses it mainly with an ethical reference—*moral judgment* as related to action. See Rom. xii. 2, where the renewing of the *voûs*, *mind*, is urged as a necessary preliminary to a right moral judgment ('that ye may prove,' etc.). The *voûs* which does not exercise this judgment is *ἀδόκιμος*, *not approved, reprobate*. See note on *reprobate*, i. 28, and compare on 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 15, where the *voûs* is associated with the *conscience*. See also on Eph. iv. 23. It stands related to *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, as the faculty to the efficient power. It is 'the faculty of moral judgment which perceives and approves what is good, but has not the power of practically controlling the life in conformity with its theoretical requirements.' In the portrayal of the struggle in this chapter there is no reference to the *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, which, on the other hand, distinctively characterizes the Christian state in ch. viii. In this chapter Paul employs only terms pertaining to the natural faculties of the human mind, and of these *voûs* is in the foreground." This note, in conjunction with the note on *πνεῦμα* in Rom. viii. 4, gives as clear and satisfactory an analysis of Paul's psychology as we have ever seen. This keen analytical power is found everywhere in these admirable volumes.

As specimens of brief and telling notes we give the following:

"IN YOUR OWN CONCEITS, Rom. xii. 16 (*παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*). Lit., *with yourselves*; in your own opinion. See ch. xi. 25, and compare Acts xxvi. 8, 'incredible *with you*'—i.e., in your judgment." An

important explanation, as the Revised Version retains the ambiguous word "conceits."

"BEARETH, 1 Cor. xii. 7 (στέγει). See on *suffer*, ch. ix. 12. It keeps out resentment as the ship keeps out water, or the roof the rain." Here the original meaning of στέγω is preserved in the explanation, where "beareth" is very indefinite.

"I SHALL BE GIVEN, Philemon 22 (χαρισθήσομαι). A beautiful assumption of his correspondent's affection for him, is that his visit to them will be a *gracious gift* (χάρις)."

In the third volume is a masterly treatment of Paul's argument in the 9th, 10th and 11th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, which ought to be published in a separate volume to increase its circulation and disabuse the minds of many, who have been taught that in the 9th chapter Paul makes God's dealings with men arbitrary, a teaching that proceeds from a narrow view of isolated texts and fails to see the connection of thought.

Dr. Vincent has established his reputation in these volumes as a careful, conscientious, and bold scholar, loving and honoring the Word, and in interpreting it, *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*. We shall impatiently await his next volume, which will conclude the series.

HOWARD CROSBY.

THE WRITERS OF GENESIS AND RELATED TOPICS ILLUSTRATING DIVINE REVELATION. By Rev. E. COWLEY, D.D. New York: Thomas Whitaker, 1890, 12mo, pp. 184, \$1.00.

This is another of those books undertaken with no particular technical knowledge such as should have made itself evident in the treatment of a subject which is only properly handled by a specialist. One might have expected to find something about the "documents" which are well-nigh universally recognized as the component parts of Genesis and the following books. Instead of this, the author says, "My suggestions of authorship are not based on Astruc, who died in 1766. . . . That his theory should form the basis of so much modern criticism surprises me."

His theory is that the patriarchs wrote the account of their own lives and times, and that Moses was the "redactor." "I shall endeavor, in these pages, to put the average reader in possession of the facts and methods whereby he can determine who were the probable writers of the first book of the Bible." But in the progress of his investigation, and in the statement of his conclusions, he says, in reference to the "differences of style and of verbal characteristics," "I shall waste no words on the orthography, syntax, or grammar of the writers," and, in fact, he has not. The whole seems to be constructed on the basis of the English Bible, with no inconvenient questions suggested by the Hebrew text.

Unfortunately, the writer has not seen fit to give us a table which should show who wrote the various parts of the book of Genesis. Such a table would have been a curiosity. The assertion is that, "He (Adam) may even have learned to write the account of his education and of Eve's creation before he died." The other patriarchs, down to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are supposed to have done the same, and to have carefully handed down their memoirs. He supposes evidently that the Flood was universal, and gets over the break at Noah by the aid of Berossus, who says that "Xisuthros—another name for Noah—was commanded, just before the Deluge, to bury all written documents known to him at Sippara; . . ." and so this ingenious

theory progresses. At last the records were all in Egypt, and there were multiplied. In them Moses was duly indoctrinated. After his flight from Egypt "he became an inspired commentator of them," for he "had obtained copies of those records by purchase long before his flight." Such is the theory. But even the author says, "I can but think that the reader will here find that the last word has not been said, and that the application of modern discoveries to the Oracles of God will . . . enable us to determine *who* were the writers of Genesis and of some other books." . . . I commend what is here offered to Professors Green and Harper, Bissell and Briggs, Cave and Cheyne, Dods and Driver, and to all other Bible students." The theory is claimed to have good support—"The literatures of the oldest nations sustain my view; a decent respect for the opinions of mankind supports it; the culture and good sense of the covenant-patriarchs support it." "The point at which we start, and to which we must return, is the probability that Abraham could read and write."

The book contains also a few other things: one short paper is mentioned thus in the Preface, "Hebrew and Greek Ethics was to correct Mr. Gladstone's third paper on Holy Scripture."

And in closing his preface, the author modestly says, "If my aim has been high, I trust I have been enabled to reach the mark."

C. R. GILLET.

NEW YORK.

SOME CENTRAL POINTS IN OUR LORD'S MINISTRY. By HENRY WACE, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, etc. New York: Thomas Whitaker, 1890, 12mo, pp. xv., 352. Cloth, \$1.75.

The Sermons in this volume—it is a volume of Sermons—were originally written for the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn Chapel, and therefore for an audience of exceptional thoughtfulness. There is probably no congregation in England for whom mere rhetoric would be less appropriate, and accordingly these short discourses are in style severely simple. They indicate careful thinking, and possess even an amount of originality which could scarcely be expected in the treatment of subjects which have been expounded and applied thousands of times over. Dr. Wace endeavors first of all to enable his readers to understand and appreciate the exact circumstances of each particular miracle or parable or instruction which he undertakes to apply to the necessities of our own spiritual life; and no method of studying our Lord's sayings and doings can possibly be more satisfactory. In fact, on any other plan, an expositor is only too likely to miss altogether the real meaning of Christ's words, and to use them simply as mottoes to which he may attach edifying but irrelevant reflections of his own. Moreover, as Dr. Wace remarks in his preface, this more accurate method of study furnishes indirectly a very forcible proof of the historic veracity of the Gospel narrative.

These Discourses are founded in a degree very far from common on a firm belief in the Incarnation; that is to say, the *whole* doctrine or mystery of the Incarnation. It is scarcely too much to say that a large portion of Christian teaching about our Lord's Ministry has for its object, however unintentionally, the destruction of that doctrine by the removal of its mysteriousness. A mystery may be defined as two or more facts which we know on equally conclusive evidence, but which we cannot possibly harmonize. Such is the mys-

tery of human nature, which includes "matter" and "spirit"—freedom of will and subjection to fixed laws. We habitually act upon the confident belief of both these facts, but theoretically they are mutually exclusive; and every attempt to harmonize them ends in the temporary denial of one of the facts, which on the next occasion of action reasserts itself. Similarly, the doctrine of the Incarnation is the statement of two facts, the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ. Assuming the veracity of the Four Gospels, both these facts are equally certain; but on any conceivable theory they are mutually exclusive. Science, whether physical or metaphysical, resents contradictions, and exists for the very purpose of discovering harmony; therefore, Theology, as a science, is forever trying to resolve the mystery of the Incarnation. Thus we had, in the first centuries, Docetism in naked simplicity, frankly discarding a real humanity. Even in these last days we have so great a theologian as the late Canon Liddon asserting a humanity which in infancy knew all Hebrew literature, and was infallibly certain of the authorship of Psalm cx., and of the mode of composition of the Pentateuch. We have a humanity sublimated into a mere metaphysical entity to which no concrete human being ever does or can exactly correspond; like the "substance" of an orange when you have removed weight, specific gravity, shape, color, fragrance, rind, juice, seeds, and all sensible qualities. Now, Dr. Wace frankly admits the *mystery* of the Incarnation, and deals with the two facts of which the doctrine is the verbal expression *one by one*, dealing with them as they appear in the Evangelic History, and as they serve our spiritual needs.

This is admirably illustrated by his second Sermon on *Our Lord's Motive*, and the third on *Our Lord's Education*. Take, for example, this passage from the third, or the text, "They found Him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors," etc.

"The purpose for which He had lingered in the Temple is indicated by the occupation in which He was engaged when found by His parents. 'He was sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions.' He was taking advantage, it appears, of a custom that, on Sabbaths and feast days, such as those of the Paschal week, the members of the Temple Sanhedrin were wont to come out on the terrace of the Temple, and there to teach. In such popular instruction great latitude of questioning is believed to have been allowed; and it is in this audience, which sat on the ground, surrounding and questioning with the doctors, that the child Jesus was found.

"The point, then, of His answer lay in the consideration that it was inevitable He should take so precious an opportunity as was afforded by His presence in Jerusalem at the Paschal feast for seeking instruction from the doctors of the Temple in that Divine law in which they were the recognized authorities. If He was to fulfil His mission, that which He felt to be essential, and which His parents ought also to have felt to be essential, was that He should acquire the most thorough understanding of the sacred learning of His nation—of the Law and of the Prophets. Even by Him, in His human nature, the knowledge of His Father's business could not be attained by the inspiration of His own spirit alone, or by His personal intercourse with His Father in the intimate communings of His own heart. His Father's business was to be learned in the Temple; and in the Temple, not simply as a place of worship, but as a place in which all the legal, historical, and prophetic significance of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, of the history of

His nation, and of its sacred Ceremonies, was best understood and taught. On this, and not merely on personal spiritual devotion or general moral truths, was our Lord's attention directed, for the purpose of increasing in wisdom, and with this object was He sitting among the doctors, seeking to imbue His human soul with the secrets of the sacred lore."

If the *Incarnate* Son of God were a *real* man—that is to say, if the Incarnation be a *Mystery*—it is obvious that our Lord's education must have been of the kind here described. If the Son of God did not submit Himself to the limitations of time and space, which include limitations of knowledge, then the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy is much more credible than the Gospel according to St. Luke. The abundant controversy in *The (London) Guardian* and elsewhere, arising out of the publication of *Luz Mundi*—and especially the letters of Archdeacon Denison—furnish the most unmistakable evidence of the unconscious Docetism of much of our modern theology. If Our Lord could be mistaken about a psalm, or ignorant of the mode of construction of the Pentateuch, He could not be God—that is the argument. Similarly, if there was a time in His earthly life when He did not know the Hebrew alphabet, He could not be God. Therefore, there never was a time when Jesus of Nazareth did not know the alphabet. This is exactly the ground taken by the writers of the Apocryphal Gospels (see *Gospel of Thomas*, vii., Cowper's Translation: "The Child, beginning at Alpha, said of Himself the twenty-two letters"). But if Jesus learned from the doctors, what marvel is it that He never even considered literary and critical questions which at that time had never been raised? The answer to the argument, "If our Lord did not know the authorship of a particular Psalm He was not divine," is plainly this: the word "divine," for the purpose of the argument, must mean "divine and *nothing* else;" whereas the mystery of the Incarnation is that our Lord was "divine and *something* else."

Again, in dealing with our Lord's *Temptation in the Wilderness*, Dr. Wace indicates the same sure grasp of the *mystery* of the Incarnation.

"One other consideration may be mentioned which should lead us to look in these simple words for experiences of the most profound import. Few things are more striking, in considering our Lord's teaching, than the earnestness with which again and again He dwells on the danger of temptation. The one human soul that overcame all temptation was also the one human soul that—it does not seem too much to say—dreaded it the most. Doubtless, His temptations were the most terrible of all, but so also was His ability to resist them; and that He should have uttered such repeated warnings against the danger of temptation is a momentous illustration of the spiritual and moral peril to which human nature is exposed. In one touching sentence He seems to sum up the whole of His experience in this word 'temptation.' 'Ye,' He said to His disciples, as though intimating the deepest of all bonds between Himself and them—'ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations, and I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me.' 'Father,' He exclaims, 'save Me from this hour,' but immediately submits His will by adding, 'but for this cause came I unto this hour.' 'Remove this cup from Me; nevertheless not My will, but Thine, be done.' What but the intensest experience of human struggle, the most profound sense of the shrinking of the human will from its most deadly

trials, could have elicited such appeals to His Father? Accordingly, it is from the depth of His own experience of human weakness, in the hour of His own struggle with the most awful of all temptations, that He exclaims to His disciples, 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' More than once, in that supreme moment, as if impelled by His own experience of the terrible struggle to which human nature might be exposed, does He utter that warning. At the commencement of that agony in the garden, 'when He was at the place, He said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation.' Was it not only an apprehension of the struggle that was to follow, but a remembrance also of His great temptation at the outset of His ministry, which was partly present to His mind in that exclamation?"

It is scarcely too much to say that the treatment of the Temptation is the crucial test of a firm belief of the *mystery* of the Incarnation. A temptation is an inducement to do wrong. That God, as God, should be "tempted with evil" is wholly inconceivable; for not only does He infinitely loathe what is wrong, but is utterly incapable of being deceived by any of the disguises by which evil conceals itself from the true judgment of men.

A third example of Dr. Wace's firm hold and skilful application of this mystery is to be found in the Fourteenth Sermon—on the Story of the Woman of Canaan. Consider the following passage (pp. 259-261):

"It was contrary to the settled plan of our Lord's ministry that its blessings should, at this stage, be extended to any others than the Jews; and consequently when this woman appealed to Him, she was asking Him to depart from an important principle of His ordinary conduct. His ministry was governed by certain laws, which had been determined for purposes of the highest import, and it was no easy matter for Him to depart from them.

"Looking at the matter from this point of view, it may be that the apparent harshness of our Lord is really an indication of a precisely opposite feeling. It may be that, in the first instance, He answered her not a word, because, so far as we may attribute human emotions to His conduct, her appeal raised in Him a conflict of feelings, and He knew not how to answer her. On the one hand, His merciful heart would be touched to its depths by the spectacle of her misery and her patient love for her daughter; on the other hand, He was restrained from yielding to His first impulse by the principles of His ministry. We may be permitted to apply to Him the language of the Evangelist on another occasion, and say that he feared He 'could not do' the work of mercy which He nevertheless longed to perform. He cannot explain it to the woman, and so He answers her not a word. When His disciples appeal to Him, He gives them at once the real reason of His hesitation—He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel—and they, with His commission to them still fresh in their memories, feel that the argument cannot be answered. But when the woman refuses to be repulsed, and falls at His feet, He is compelled to tell her the reason also; and if we may conceive that conflict of feelings of which I have spoken, it may, perhaps, be felt to be a mark, not of harshness, but of the deepest sympathy, that our Lord should couch the reason in still severer terms. Deep feeling struggling to conceal itself is wont to seek protection in such severe expressions, which derive their very harshness from the depth of the emotion which they are endeavoring to conceal and to repress.

All this appears perfectly natural, perfectly in harmony with the effect which would be produced in a mind of intense pity, checked by some law in the indulgence of its impulse of mercy. And so, when at length, as Luther says, the woman, by a master stroke, ensnares our Lord in His own words, and turns His reason—His real reason—for refusing her into an argument for His help, we may well regard Him as really, and not apparently, overpowered by her faith and trust, and the deepest emotions of His heart break forth in His words, 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' The woman had actually succeeded, by her earnest importunity and trust, in inducing our Lord, at a time in some respects most inopportune, to infringe a settled principle of His ministry. She had wrestled with Him, against His own fixed determination, and had compelled Him, as it were, to give free play to His love, independently of the restraint of the laws under which He was for a time acting."

Sermons do not easily lend themselves to criticism, and these by Dr. Wace have here been considered only from a single point of view. But they are very far, indeed, above the average. The style is clear and manly, and the matter both indicates and suggests careful thought. WILLIAM KIRKUS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

ARTICLES ON ROMANISM: MONSIGNOR CAPEL; DR. LITLEDALE. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, S.T.D. New York: Thomas Whitaker, Bible House, 1890. Pp. 200, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

In this neat little volume three essays by the author are put in more permanent form and more accessible shape than in the files of the *American Church Review*, in which they were first published. Two of the articles have reference to Monsignor Capel; the first being a review of his "Catholic: an Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church," followed by certain correspondence drawn out by its appearance in print; the second being a continuation and further expansion of the former article, with a reply to the "Open Letter" of the Monsignor.

The third essay is a review of Dr. Richard F. Littledale's "Petrine Claims," in the shape of a running commentary upon the book.

The whole is enriched by an index, which is reasonably full. C. R. GILLET.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Achelis, Hans, Dr. Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechtes. 1 Buch: Die Canones Hippolyti. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur von Osc. von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack, Band VI., Heft 4.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. viii., 256, 8vo, 9.50 mk. (Complete, 26.50 mk.)

Adams, Emma H. Savonarola. The Florentine Martyr. San Francisco: Pacific Press, 1890. Pp. vi., 160, 12mo, 50 cts.

Aitchison, J. Signa Christi: Evidences of Christianity set forth in the Person and Work of Christ. London: Cassell, 1890. Pp. 302, 8vo, 5s.

Alexander, G. G. Confucius, the Great Teacher: A study. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 332, 8vo, 6s.

Appeal to Unitarians: Being a record of religious experiences. By a convert from Unitarianism. London: Longmans, 1890. 8vo, 3s.

Archibald, Andrew W., Rev. The Bible Verified: with an introductory note by Ransom B. Welch, D.D. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. Pub., 1890. Pp. ii., 215, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Athins, Frederick A. Moral Muscle, and How to Use It. A brotherly chat with young men. With an introduction by the Rev. Thain Davidson, D.D. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. viii., 82, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bachmann, Johs., Dr. Präparation und Commentar zum Deutero-Jesaja, mit wortgetreuer Uebersetzung. 1. Heft. Kap. xi.-xlviii. Berlin: Mayer, 1890. Pp. 72, 8vo, 1.30 mk. Präparation und Commentar zur Genesis. 1. Heft. Kap. i.-xi. Berlin: Mayer, 1890. Pp. 56, 8vo, 80 pf. Präparation zu den kleinen Propheten. 4. Heft: Uebersetzung und Dispositionen von Joel, Micha, Obadja, Amos. Berlin: Mayer, 1890. Pp. 38, 8vo, 50 pf. (Hefte 1-4, 2.60 mk.)

Baird, J. Studies in the Spiritual Life. London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 274, 8vo, 4s.

Barry, A., Rt. Rev., Bp. Lectures on Christianity and Socialism, Delivered at the Lambeth Baths in February and March, 1890. London: Cassell, 1890. Pp. 182, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Basmajain, K. H. Social and Religious Life in the Orient. With numerous illustrations. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 246, 12mo, \$1.00.

Bassenge, E. Die Sendung Augustins zur Bekehrung der Angelsachsen. (596-604 n. Chr.) Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 73, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Bellesheim, Adolph, Dr. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Irland von der Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die Gegenwart. 2. Band von 1569 bis 1690. Mit einer Karte Irlands vom Jahre 1570. Mainz: Kirchheim 1890. Pp. xxxv., 772, 8vo, 16.60 mk. (Bände 1 und 2, 31.00 mk.)

Bersier, Eugène. Quelques pages de l'histoire des Huguenots. Préface par Auguste Sabatier. Paris, 1890.

Bertrand, Joseph. Blaise Pascal. Paris: Lévy, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Bibb, C. W. Sharpened Arrows and Polished Stones: a collection of Scripture texts and illustrations for the Christian worker and the home. With an introduction by the Rev. A. J. Gordon. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 320, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bickford, J. An Autobiography of Christian Labor in the West Indies, Demerara, Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia. 1838-88. London: Kelly, 1890. Pp. 412, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Blackall, C. R., and Mrs. E. L. Stories about Jesus. Philadelphia: Griffith, 1890. Pp. 271, 8vo, \$1.25.

Bonney, T. G., Rev. Abbeys and Churches of England and Wales: descriptive, historical, pictorial. Second series: London: Cassell, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo, 21s.

Booth, Mrs. Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State, and eight other addresses delivered at Cannon Street Hotel. London: Salvation Army, 1890. Pp. 92, 12mo, 6d.

Booth, W. Training of Children: or, how to make the children into saints and soldiers of Jesus Christ. London: Salvation Army, 1890. 12mo, 1s. 6d.

Boston Homilies. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1891. By members of the alpha chapter of the Convocation of Boston University. First series. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. viii., 408, 8vo, \$1.25.

Bouffroy, A., Abbé. Rome, ses monuments, ses souvenirs. Rome chrétienne, Rome païenne, Rome souterraine, Rome artistique. Lille: Desclée, 1890. Pp. 308, 8vo.

Bubl, Frants, Prof., Dr. Leipzig. Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: W. Faber, 1891, 8vo. Pp. vi., 282, 6 mk.

Chabauty, E. A., Abbé. Études scripturales, patristiques, théologiques et philosophiques sur l'avenir de l'Eglise catholique selon le plan divin, ou la Régénération de l'humanité et la Rénovation de l'Univers. Tome II. Poitiers: Oudin, 1890. Pp. vi., 473, 8vo.

Chevalier, Jules. Memoire historique sur les hérésies en Dauphiné avant le XVIe siècle, accompagné de documents inédits sur les sorciers et les Vaudois. Valence: Lechevalier, 1890. 8vo, 5 fr.

Clair, C., Père. La Vie de saint Ignace de Loyola, d'après Pierre Ribadeneira, son premier historien. Paris: Plon, 1890. Pp. iv., 464, 4to, 20 fr.

Clemen, Carl, Dr. Die religions philosophische Bedeutung des stoisch-christlichen Endänanismus in Justino Apologie. Studien und Vorarbeiten. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. viii., 158, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Cochrane, Robert. Beneficent and Useful Lives. London: Chambers, 1890. Pp. 290, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Cölln, Ed. von. Dr. Martinus Luther. Von der Clausur zur Ehe. 1505-25. Ein Reformationsepos. Danzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 180, 8vo, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Coignet, Mme. C. La Réforme française avant les guerres civiles. 1512-59. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Couard, Herm., Pastor. Die Briefe Pauli an die Theessalonicher, an den Timotheus, Titus, und Philemon. (Das Neue Testament, Bibellehren durch Umschreibung und Erläuterung erklärt, Band VIII.) Potsdam: Stein, 1890. 8vo, 1.40 mk. (Bände, I.-VIII., 13.50 mk.)

Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature. No. 1. London: Simpkin, 1890. (Edinburgh: Clark.) Pp. 106, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Crolet, L., L'Abbé. Doctrine philosophique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin, resumée d'après le docteur Stockl. Besançon: Outhenin-Chalandre, 1890. Pp. xix., 398, 18mo.

Dale, R. W., LL.D. The Living Christ and the Four Gospels. New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. xii., 299, 12mo, \$1.50.

Deiff, H. K., Hugo, Dr. Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des vier Evangeliums. Supplement zu der Schrift "Das vier Evangelium, eine authentische Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth." Husum: Deiff, 1890. Pp. 37, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Douglas, George C. M. The Six Intermediate Minor Prophets. (Handbooks for Bible classes.) Edinburgh: Clark. (New York: Scribner & W.), 1890. Pp. 157, 8vo, 60 cts.

Dreadner, Albert, Ph.D. Kultur und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Breslau: W. Koebner, 1890. Pp. xvi., 392, 8vo, 10. mk.

Druschky, Pastor. Ueber den Sinn und den Gedankengang in den Reden Jesu Lucas, Cap. 15. und 16. Ein Versuch. Erlangen: Böhm, 1891. Pp. iv., 106, 12mo, 1.30 mk.

Drysdale, A. H. Early Bible Songs. (By-paths of Bible knowledge.) London: Tract Soc., 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Elbel, P. Benj., O. S. Fr. Theologia moralis per modum conferentiarum. Novis curis ed. Lect. P. F. Ireneus Bierbaum, O. S. Fr. Vol. I. (3 partes) Pars I. De actis humanis, conscientia, legibus atque peccatis. Paderborn: Bonifacius Druckerei, 1891. (1890.) Pp. xiii., 254, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

Evers, G. G. Martin Luther. Lebens und Charakterbild, vom ihm selbst gezeichnet in seinen eigenen Schriften und Correspondenzen. Heft 13. Bd. VI. Pp. 1-368. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. 8vo, 3.40 mk.

Faggi, Ad. La filosofia dell'inconsciente metafisica e morale. Firenze, 1890. Pp. 205, 8vo, 5 mk.

Farrar, F. W., Rev., D.D. The Minor Prophets. (Men of the Bible Series.) New York: Randolph, 1890. Pp. vii., 245, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Faunce, D. W., Rev., D.D. Prayer as a Theory and Fact. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. ii., 256, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Favre, Mme. Jules, née Velten. La Morale de Cicéron. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 4 fr.

Foster, Rich. Rousseau und die deutsche Geschichtsphilosophie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus. Stuttgart: Göschen, 1890. Pp. x., 340, 8vo, 5.50 mk.

Fox, Luther A. Evidence of a Future Life. Philadelphia: Luth. Publ. Soc., 1890. Pp. vi., 378, 12mo.

France, l'Abbé. Kerduel, ou les Missionnaires du XVIIe siècle au pays de Lannion. Saint-Brieuc: Prud'homme, 1890. Pp. 296, 18mo.

Friedlaender, Levi, Rabbi. La Tosephta, livraison: Naschim, avec lecommentaire: Heshech Schlomch, tirée d'un grand nombre d'œuvres et manuscrits. Corrigée, nouvellement classée, complètement simplifiée et expliquée avec l'aide des sources talmudique et littéraire. (Vol. II. in hebr. Sprache.) Pressbourg, 1890. Pp. xvi., 248, 8vo, 3 mk. (Vol. I. and II., 6.40 mk.)

Fuerst, Julius, Dr., Rabbiner. Glossarium Graeco Hebraeum oder der griechischen Wörterschatz der jüdischen Midrascherwerke. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Altertumskunde. 1ste Lieferung. Strassburg: Trübner, 1890. Pp. 1-48, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Ganser, Ant. Die Wahrheit. Kurze Darlegung der letzten und wahren Weltprincipien. Entwurf zu einer transcendentalen Logik. Graz: Leuschner, 1890. Pp. 54, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Gilbert, Jessie S., Rev., A.M. Blessed are They; or, thoughts on the beatitudes. Paterson, N. J.: Herrick, 1890. Pp. 69, 12mo.

Gladstone, W. E., Right Hon., M.P. The Improbable Rock of Holy Scripture. From *The Sunday-School Times*. Philadelphia: Wattles, 1890. Pp. 358, 12mo, \$1.00.

Glasebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. Senior course. Vol. II. The death of Saul to Nehemiah. London: Percival, 1890. Pp. 346, 12mo, 2s 6d.

Goldziner, Ign. Muhammedanische Studien. II. Theil. Halle a. S. Niemeyer. Pp. x., 430, 12 mk. (Theile I. und II. 50 mk.)

Gray, E. W. The New Religion: A Gospel of Love. Chicago: Thorne Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. xiv., 429, 8vo, \$7.50.

Green, R. The Mission of Methodism: Being the twentieth Fernley Lecture, delivered in Bristol, Aug. 4, 1890. London: Wesl. Conf. Office, 1890. Pp. 234, 8vo, 2s.

Griffis, William Elliott, D.D. Honda the Samurai. A Story of Modern Japan. Boston and Chicago: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 390, 12mo, \$1.50.

Grimm, Ed. Zur Geschichte des Erkenntnisproblems. Von Bacon zu Hume. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. Pp. xii., 596, 8vo, 12 mk.

Guerin, Louis, Abbé. Deux grands Chrétiens. Le Docteur A. Fabre et Charles Ranque. Lille: Desclée, 1890. Pp. 235, 8vo.

Hamerling, Rob. Die Atomistik des Willens. Beiträge zur Kritik der modernen Erkenntnis. 2. Bände. Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt, 1890. Pp. xix., 297, v., 270, 8vo, 12 mk.

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. (Holtzmann, Lipsius, Schmiedel, und Soden.) II. 1. Schmiedel, P. W., Prof.—1, 2. Thessalonicherbrief—1, 2. Korintherbrief, (Erste Hälfte.) Freiburg i.-B.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. 1-112, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Hansjacob, Heinr., Prof., Dr. St. Martin zur Freiburg als Kloster und Pfarrei. Geschichtlich dargestellt. Mit einem Titelbild, etc. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. vii., 206, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Harris, H. The Old Testament Scriptures. London: Providence, 1890. Pp. 42, 12mo, 1s.

Harris, J. Rendel. Biblical Fragments from Mount Sinai. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1890. 4to, 10s. 6d.

Hatch, E. The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. (Hibbert Lectures, 1888.) Edited by A. M. Fairbairn. London: Williams & N., 1890. Pp. 366, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Hayes, Lucy Webb. A Memorial, by Mrs. John Davies. As read at the Annual Meeting of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held at Indianapolis, November, 1889. Poem: In Memoriam, by Miss M. A. Lathbury. Memorial paper, by Mrs. R. S. Rust. Addresses by Mrs. Hayes delivered at several annual meetings. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1890. Pp. 104, 12mo.

Henner, Camillo, Dr. Beiträge zur Organisation und Competenz der päpstlichen Ketzengerichte. Leipzig: Duncker, 1890. Pp. xli., 383, 8vo, 8.80 mk.

Hettinger, Franz, Dr. Timotheus. Briefe an einen jungen Theologen. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. xli., 549, 8vo, 4 mk.

Hilaire, Saint Antoine de Padoue. Sa légende primitive et autres pièces historiques, avec des sermons inédits et nouveaux et un Manuel de dévotion. Neuville-sous-Montreuil: Duquat, 1890. Pp. ii., 290, 8vo.

Houghton, Louise Seymour. The Life of Christ. New York: Am. Tr. Soc. 1890. Pp. 255, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Hutton, Hugh, Rev. A Private Book of Devotions. Boston: Lee & S., 1890. Pp. vi., 131, 16mo, 30 cts.

Inglis, J., Rev., D.D. Bible Illustrations from the New Hebrides: with notices of the progress of the Mission. New York: Nelsons, 1890. Pp. vi., 356, 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

Jastrow, M., Ph.D. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babil and Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature. Part IV. New York: Putnam, 1890. Pp. 289-384, 8vo, \$2.00.

Johnson, E. The Rise of Christendom. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 516, 8vo, 14s.

Kallmeyer, Thdr., Pastor. Die evangelischen Kirchen und Prediger Kurlands. Ergänzt, bis zur Gegenwart fortgesetzt und im Auftrage der kurländischen Gesellschaft für Literatur und Kunst herausgegeben von Dr. G. Otto. Mitau: (Bethorn), 1890. Pp. xvi., 552, 8vo, 12 mk.

Kellner, Carl Adam Heinr. Chronologie Tertulliana supplementa. Bonn: Hanstein, 1890. Pp. 34, 4to, 1.30 mk.

Kennedy, Jas., D.D. Christ in Song. Boston: Bradley & W., 1890. Pp. 332, 12mo.

Kitchin, W. C. Paoli. The Last of the Missionaries. A picture of the overthrow of the Christians in Japan in the seventeenth century. With illustrations by G. A. Traver and Henry Bouche. New York: Bonner, 1890. Pp. 468, 12mo, \$1.00.

Klein, Félix, Abbé. Les Villages d'Arabes chrétiens. Fontainebleau: Pougé, 1890. Pp. 71, 16mo, 80 ctm.

Knight, W. Essays in Philosophy, Old and New. Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1890. Pp. i., 367, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Kristeller, Samuel. Der ethische Tractat der Mischnah Pirke Aboth d. i. Sprüche der Väter übersetzt. Berlin: Speyer & Peters, 1890. Pp. viii., 87, 12mo, 1.50 mk.

Kühner, K. Augustin's Anschauung von der Erlösungsbedeutung Christi im Verhältnis zur vor-augustinischen Erlösungslehre bei den griechischen und lateinischen Vätern. Heidelberg: Groos, 1890. Pp. iii., 69, 8vo, 1 mk.

Kukula, Rich. C., Dr. Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. 2. Theil. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 66, 8vo, 1.30 mk. (1. und 2. Theil. 3.10 mk.)

Laache, N. J. Johannes's Aabenbarings Indledning og Indhold. Veiledning til dens Føøstaaelse. Thronhjelm: Bøgh, 1890. Pp. 31, 8vo.

Laengin, Georg. Die biblischen Vorstellungen vom Teufel und ihr religiöser Werth. Ein Beitrag zu der Frage: Gibt es einen Teufel? Ist der Teufel ein Gegenstand des christlichen Glaubens? Leipzig: Wigand, 1890. Pp. vi., 97, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Lagarde, Paul de. Mittheilungen. 3. Band. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1890. Pp. 376, 8vo, 10 mk. (Theile 1-3, 32 mk.)

Langen, Jos., Prof., Dr. Die Klemensromane. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Tendenzen, aufs neue untersucht. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. vii., 167, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Ledrain, E. La Bible. Traduction nouvelle d'après les textes Hébreux et Grecs. Tome VI. Les Prophètes II: Ezéchiel; les douze prophètes: Baruch; Daniel; Eptre de Jérémie. Paris: Lemerre, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Lenk, H. Ist die heilige Schrift wirklich Gottes Wort, oder, enthält sie bloss Gottes Wort? Dresden: Naumann, 1890. Pp. 61, 12mo, 1 mk.

L'Hermite, L. Les saintes causes. Paris: 1890. Pp. 253, 18mo, 2 fr.

Lightfoot, Bp. Ordination Addresses and Counsels to Clergy. London: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 306, 8vo, 6s.

Loehr, Max. Introductionis ad commentarium de Threina Jeremiae capita nonnulla. Dissertatio inauguralis theologica Königsberg i. Pr.: Koch, 1890. Pp. 35, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Löhr, P. Die Offenbarung Johannis. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Kritik und Erklärung. Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. 85, 8vo, 1 mk.

Loewenthal, Alb. Dominicus Gundisalvi und sein psychologisches Compendium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der philosophischen Literatur bei Arabern, Christen und Juden. 1. Theil. Inaugural-Dissertation. Königsberg, i. Pr.: Koch, 1890. Pp. 35, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Lumby, J. Rawson, D.D. The Acts of the Apostles (The Smaller Cambridge Bible for schools). New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 160, 16mo.

Mackay, W. A., Rev. Outpourings of the Spirit: or, a Narrative of Spiritual Awakenings in Different Ages and Countries. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. Publ., 1890. Pp. ii., 141, 24mc, cloth, 40 cts.

McPherson, J. G. Summer Sundays in a Strathmore Parish: Sermons preached in Rathven Parish Church. London: Blackwoods, 1890. 8vo, 5s.

Mally, Johs., Dr. Historia sacra Antiqui testamenti cum introductione in ejusdem testamenti libros sacros. Graun: Buzarovits, 1890. Pp. vi., 293, v., 8vo, 3.30 mk.

Martyn, Carlos. William E. Dodge, the Christian Merchant. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. Pp. vii., 349, 12mo, \$1.50.

Matheson, George, Rev. Spiritual Development of St. Paul. New York: Whitaker, 1890. Pp. vi., 324, 12mo, \$2.00.

Matthews, Frank J. Father Matthew: His Life and Times. With a portrait. New York: Cassell & Co., 1890. Pp. viii., 223, 12mo, \$1.00.

- Maudslay, A.** Old Thoughts for Young Brains. (On preaching and teaching, spring-time of life, education.) London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 202, 8vo, 1 mk.
- Miller, J. R.** Bite of Pasture; or, Handfuls of Grass for the Lord's Hungry Sheep. Being selections from sermons of—, culled and arranged by Mary A. Butler. Philadelphia: Presb. Ed. Pub., 1890. Pp. 255, 16mo, 60 cts.
- Mills, B. Fay, Rev.** Power from on High. Do we need it? What is it? Can we get it? An address delivered at the Ninth International Christian Endeavor Convention. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, 20 cts.
- Mission (la) de Vizagapatam; par un missionnaire de Saint-François-de-Sales.** Annecy: Nierat, 1890. Pp. xvi, 536, 8vo.
- Mitchell, Elizabeth H.** Forty Days in the Holy Land: before and after. With six illustrations. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 210, 8vo, 6s.
- Moulin-Eckart, Rich., Dr., Graf du.** Lendegar, Bischof von Autun. Ein Beitrag zur fränkischen Geschichte des siebennten Jahrhunderts. Breslau: Koebner, 1890. Pp. v, 108, 8vo, 2.80 mk.
- Musick, Thomas H.** The Genesis of Nature. New York: Alden, 1890. Pp. 377, 12mo.
- Naumann, O., Pastor.** Das erste Buch der Bible, nach seiner inneren Einheit und Echtheit dargestellt. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. viii, 386, 8vo, 5 mk.
- Naville, Ernest.** Le Libre arbitre. Étude philosophique. Paris: Fischbacher, 1890. 8vo, 6 fr.
- Neumayr, Emmanuel, Pastor.** Theorie des Strebens nach Thomas von Aquin. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Psychologie. 2. Theile. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 44, 33, 8vo, 80 pf.
- Nick, H.** Notion de la Metanota d'après le Nouveau Testament et l'expérience chrétienne. Thèse. Montauban: Grané, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo.
- Nikel, Johs., Dr.** Die Lehre des Alten Testaments über die Cherubim und Seraphim. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 101, 8vo, 1.50 mk.
- Noeldechen, E.** Tertullian dargestellt. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. viii, 496, 8vo, 9 mk.
- Nösgen, C. F., Prof., Dr.** Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Offenbarung. (In 2 Bänden.) 1. Band. Geschichte Jesu Christi. 1. Hälfte. München: Beck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. xii, 322, 8vo, 6 mk.
- Osborn, H. S., Prof., LL.D.** A Class-Book of Biblical History and Geography: with numerous maps. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 312, 12mo, \$1.25.
- Paetsch, Adolf.** Skizzen aus der jüdischen Priester-geschichte. Kritische Bemerkungen zu biblischen Schriften. Leipzig: Siegmund, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, 60 pf.
- Pago, Jesse.** Henry Martyn. His Life and Labors in Cambridge, India, Persia. Illustrated by H. R. Miller, etc. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. viii, 160, 12mo, 75 cts.
- Painter, F. V. N.** Luther on Education: including an historical introduction and a translation of the Reformer's two most important educational treatises. Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. ii, 282, 12mo, \$1.00.
- Peiser, Fel. Ernst.** Jurisprudentia babilonicae quae supersunt. Commentatio assyriologica. Cöthen. (Berlin: Peiser, 1890.) Pp. 41, 8vo, 2 mk.
- Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D. and M. A.** Select Notes. A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1891. Explanatory, illustrative, doctrinal, and practical. With illustrations, maps, pictures, chronology of the Old Testament, chronology and harmony of the life of Christ, suggestions to teachers, library references. New York: Ward & D., 1890. Pp. 387, 8vo.
- Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D. (and Capron, Mary J.).** The International Question Book and Scholars' Aid on the Uniform Series of the Sabbath-School Lessons Adopted by the International Committee for 1891. Part I. For the older scholars, pp. 212. Part II. Intermediate, pp. 191. Part III. For the youngest scholars. By Mary J. Capron, pp. 304. New York: Ward & D., 1890. 12mo.
- Pesch, Chm., S. J.** Gott und Götter. Eine Studie zur vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. xii, 128, 8vo, 1.70 mk.
- Pfeiderer, O.** The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and its Progress in Great Britain since 1825. Translated under the author's supervision by J. Frederick Smith. (Library of Philosophy.) London: Sonnenschein, 1890. Pp. xii, 403, 8vo. (New York: Macmillan, \$2.75.)
- Puchstein, Otto.** Pseudohethitische Kunst. Ein Vortrag. Berlin: Reimer, 1890. Pp. 22, 8vo, 1 mk.
- Rady, J. B., Prof.** Die Reformatoren in ihrer Beziehung zur Doppelthe des Landgrafen Philipp. Nach dem in den "Publicationen aus den preussischen Staatsarchiven" veröffentlichten Briefwechsel des Landgrafen mit Bucer dargestellt. Frankfurt a. M.: Foeser, 1890. Pp. iv, 131, 8vo, 2.25 mk.
- Rauschenplat, Adf., Dr.** Christenthum und Atomtheorie. Hamburg: Weitbrecht, 1890. Pp. 43, 8vo, 1 mk.
- Renan, Ernest.** Histoire du peuple d'Israël. Tome III. Paris: Lévy, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr. (Vol. I appeared 1887, Vol. II, 1888.)
- Ritten, H.** Dreissig Jahre protestantischer Mission in Japan. Berlin: Haack, 1890. Pp. xii, 126, 8vo, 2 mk.
- Rosenthal, Ludwig A., Rabbi, Dr.** Ueber den Zusammenhang der Mischna. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte. 1. Theil: Die Sadduzäer Kämpfe und die Mischna-sammlungen vor dem Auftreten Hillel's. Strassburg i. E.: Trübner, 1890. Pp. 95, 8vo, 2.50 mk.
- Ross, Charles B., Rev., M.A.** Our Father's Kingdom. Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. 189, 12mo, \$1.00.
- Roth, P.** La personne du Christ, d'après ses paroles. Thèse. Montauban: Grané, 1890. Pp. 76, 8vo.
- Sadler, M. F.** The Epistles of St. Paul to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, with notes, critical and practical. London: Bell & D., 1890. Pp. 310, 8vo, 6s.
- Saegmüller, J. B., Dr.** Die Papstwahl und die Staaten von 1447-1555. (Nikolaus V. bis Paul IV.) Eine kirchenrechtlich-historische Untersuchung über den Anfang des staatlichen Rechtes der Exklusiv in der Papstwahl. Tübingen: Laupp, 1890. Pp. vi, 238, 8vo, 4.80 mk.
- Sandoval, A. de.** Historia de Santa Catalina de Siena. Madrid: 1890.
- Scheiki, Franz, Dr.** Bilder aus der Zeit der Gegenreformation in Oesterreich, 1564-1618. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. vii, 51, 8vo, 1 mk.
- Schenkl, H.** Bibliotheca patrum latinorum Britannica. I. Wien: Tempeky, 1890. Pp. 310, 8vo.
- Schiffers, M. J., Rect., Dr. Amvâs,** das Emmaus des heiligen Lucas, 160 Stadien von Jerusalem. Mit Titelbild, ein Grundplan und eine Karte von Judäa. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. viii, 236, 8vo, 3 mk.
- Schot, J. C.** Moslemen en Christendom. Leiden: 1890. Pp. iv, 90, 8vo, 3.10 mk.
- Schrader, Eberhard,** in Verbindung mit L. Abel, C. Bezold, P. Jensen, F. E. Peiser, H. Winckler. Keilschriftliche Bibliothek. Sammlung von assyrischen und babilonischen Texten in Umschrift und Uebersetzung. 3. Band, 2. Hälfte. Berlin: Reuter, 1890. Pp. iv, 147, 8vo, 6 mk. (Bänden 1. 2. und 3. II.: 27 mk.)
- Schubert, Hans von, Dr.** Die evangelische Trauung, ihre Geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung. Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xiv, 158, 8vo, 3.60 mk.
- Schwarzlose, Karl, Dr.** Der Bilderstreit. Ein Kampf der griechischen Kirche um ihre Eigenart und um ihre Freiheit. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. viii, 266, 8vo, 5 mk.
- Sepp, J. W. B., Prof., Dr.** Die Religion der alten Deutschen und ihr Fortbestand in Volkssagen, Aufzügen und Festbräuchen bis zur Gegenwart. Mit durchgreifenden Religionsvergleichung. München: Lindauer, 1890. Pp. xx, 419, 8vo, 6 mk.
- Sprague, Philo W., Rev.** Christian Socialism, What and Why? What is socialism? What are its causes? How can the great social and economic changes it involves be brought about by just and orderly methods? With appendix. Address of the Bishop of Durham on socialism. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. vi, 304, 16mo, 50 cts.
- Stearns, Lewis French., Rev., D.D.** The Evidences of Christian Experience: being the Ely Lectures for 1890. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. viii, 473, 12mo, \$2.00.
- Steere, Bp.** Notes of Sermons on the Psalms, etc. Edited by Rev. R. M. Heaney, with an introductory letter by Rev. F. Paget. Vol. III. London: Bell & S., 1890. Pp. 360, 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- Stevens, George B., Ph.D., D.D.** A Short Exposition on the Epistle to the Galatians. Designed as a text-book for class-room use and private study. Hartford: Student Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. vii, 240, 8vo.
- Stirling, J. H.** Philosophy and Theology: being the first Edinburgh University Gifford Lectures. Edinburgh: Clark, 1890. Pp. xvi, 406, 8vo. (New York: Scribner & W., \$3.75.)

Sutter, J. Luther and the Cardinal. An historical and biographical tale of the Reformation in Germany. London: 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Thomas, W. H. Mormon Saints. With illustrations. (A study of Mormonism.) London: Houlston, 1890. Pp. 190, 12mo, 1s.

Thompson, Leila. Modern Miracles; being manifestations of God's love and power. With a preface by the Rev. Alexander McLaren, D.D. New York: Carters, 1890. Pp. 156, 12mo.

Through the Quick sands of Doubt to the Rock of Belief. By an English rector. London: Griffith, 1890. 8vo, 1s.

Tidball, Thos. A., D. D. Christ in the New Testament. With an introduction by S. D. McConnell, D. D. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. ix., 357, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Toy, Crawford Howell, Prof. (Harvard). Judaism and Christianity. A sketch of the progress of thought from Old Testament to New Testament. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1890. Pp. xvii., 436, 8vo, \$3.00.

Trede, Th. Das Heidentum in der römischen Kirche. Bilder aus dem religiösen und sittlichen Leben Süditaliens. 3. Theil. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. iii., 426, 8vo, 6 mk. 1-3 Theile, 16 mk.

Trümpelmann, A. Die Predigt am Muldenstein. Episode aus Luther's Leben in dramatischem Form. Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. vii., 8vo, 20 pf.

Tux, Norbertus a. Compendium theologie fundamentalis opus scripturam Rmi. P. Alberti a Bulsano, altiorumque probatorum auctorum concinnavit et in usum præcipue scholæ adaptavit.—Vol. I. De religione et revelatione. Brixen: Kathol.-polit. Pressvereins, 1890. Pp. viii., 332, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Tyng, Charles Rockland. Record of the Life and Work of the Rev. Stephen Higginson Tyng, D.D., and history of St. George's Church, New York, at the close of his rectorship. Compiled by his son, —. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. 682, 8vo, \$3.50.

Vernet, A., Th. B. Les Généalogies de Jésus-Christ (Thèse). Montauban: Granicé, 1890. Pp. 63, 8vo.

Vilmar, Aug. Frdr. Christ., Dr. Collegium biblicum. Praktische Erklärung der heiligen Schrift. Alten und Neuen Testaments. Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlass der akademischen Vorlesungen, herausgegeben von Prof. Chrn. Müller. Des Alten Testaments. I. Theil. 1. Lieferung (in 15 Lieferungen). Neue Ausgabe. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. vi., 192, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Vincent, John H., Bishop. Studies in Young Life: A series of word-pictures and practical papers. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. Pp. vi., 254, 12mo.

Wace, Henry, D. D. Some Central Points on Our Lord's Ministry. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. xv., 352, 12mo, \$1.25.

Walker, Norman L., Rev., D. D. The Church Standing of the Children. New York: Scribner & W., 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, 25 cts.

Walther, Wilh., Pastor. Luther's Bibelübersetzung kein Plagiat. Leipzig: Deichert, 1890. Pp. iii., 47, 8vo, 80 pf.

Watts, Robert, Prof., D. D., LL. D. A New Apologetic; or, the down grade in criticism, theology, and science. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xxv., 353, 12mo, \$2.25.

Wendt, H. H., Dr., Prof., in Heidelberg. Der Anhalt der Lehre Jesu. Darstellender Theil des Werkes "Die Lehre Jesu." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1890. Pp. xiv., 678, 8vo, 12 mk. (Complete, 19 mk.)

Whiton, J. M. What of Samuel? (A view of Samuel as prophet, king-maker and politician.) London: Clarke, 1890. Pp. 74, 8vo, 1s.

Wigand, Adb., Pastor. August Neander's Leben (1789-1890). 2 Ausgabs. Erfurt: Bartholomäus, 1890. Pp. x., 152, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Wilson, Edward L. In Scripture Lands. New views of sacred places. With one hundred and fifty illustrations from original photographs by the author. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xvi., 356, 8vo, \$3.00.

Wimpfen, Max Frhr., v. Dr. Kritische Worte über den Buddhismus. Wien: Konegen, 1891 (1890.) Pp. 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

Wynne, F. R. Plain Proofs of the Great Facts of Christianity, for the Help of Minds Perplexed with Difficulties. London: Hodder, 1890. 3d ed. Pp. 88, 12mo, 1s. 6d.

Żródlowski, Ferd., Prof., Dr. Theologische und politische Erwägungen. Zürich: 1890. Pp. 65, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

IN HARPER'S for January, Charles Dudley Warner, in a paper of great practical value, describes "The Outlook in Southern California." Many illustrations of scenery and interesting objects in the fruit-growing regions of California accompany the paper. The very popular series of articles on South America is resumed by Mr. Child in this number, giving his "Impressions of Peru." This paper is also profusely illustrated. F. Anstey contributes an article on "London Music Halls," which is illustrated from a number of drawings by Joseph Pennell. In "Another Chapter of My Memoirs," Mr. De Bowitz tells how he became a journalist, and relates some interesting reminiscences of the Franco-Prussian War and the days of the Paris Commune. The chief place in fiction is given to the opening chapters of Charles Egbert Caddock's new novel, "In the Stranger People's Country," which is illustrated by W. T. Smedley. "At the 'Casa Napoleon'" is a story of life in the Spanish quarter of New York City, written by Thomas A. Janvier, and illustrated by Smedley. "A Modern Legend" is a beautiful short story by Vida D. Scudder. "Saint Anthony—a Christmas Eve Ballad," by Mrs. E. W. Latimer, is accompanied by three striking illustrations from drawings by C. S. Reinhart.

LITTLE'S LIVING AGE FOR 1891. This periodical has had a successful career of nearly fifty years, and it only improves as it grows older. A weekly magazine, it gives over three and a quarter thousand large and well-filled pages of reading matter—forming four large volumes—every year. Its frequent issue and ample space enable it to present with freshness and completeness the ablest essays, reviews and criticisms, the choicest serial and short stories, the most interesting sketches of travel and discovery, the best poetry, and the most valuable biographical, historical, scientific, and political information from the entire body of foreign periodical literature, and from the pens of the most eminent writers of the time.

The subscription price (\$8 a year) is low for the amount of reading furnished. To any subscriber desiring to take more than one other periodical in connection with one copy of *The Living Age* the publishers will forward clubbing rates on application. Little & Co., Boston, are the publishers.

SCRIBNER'S for January presents these articles: "The Pigmies of the Great African Forest," by Henry M. Stanley (illustrated); "Japonica" second paper, Japanese People by Sir Edwin Arnold (illustrated); "A Truce," by Mary Tappan Wright (with an unpublished poem by Arthur Sherburne Hardy); "The Two Gates," by Margaret Vandegrift; "Modern Fire Apparatus," by John R. Sparac (illustrated); "To Carmine," by I. D.; "Jerry," Part III., Chapters IV.-V. (began in June, 1890—to be continued); "Botticelli's Madonna in the Louvre," by Edith Wharton; "Impressions of Australia," by Josiah Royce (illustrated); "The Rothenburg Festival-Play," by E. H. Lockwood (illustrated); "Court Tennis," by James Dwight, with illustrations; "Three Charades," by L. R. R. Briggs; "The Water Devil," a marine tale, by Frank R. Stockton (to be concluded in February); "The Architect's Point of View," by William F. P. Longfellow; "The Point of View," The Philosophy of Flattery—Vanity in Artists—Artists as Critics.

THE CENTURY for January has these contents: "Portrait of Augustus Saint-Gaudens," from a painting by Kenyon Cox; "Along the Lower James," by Charles Washington Coleman (illustrated); "Kenyon Cox," by William A. Coffin (illustrated); "An Irish Gentlewoman in the Famine Time," by Octave Thanet; "The Two Spirits," by James B. Kenyon; "Among the Mongols of the Azure Lake," by W. Woodville Rockhill (illustrated); "The Memoirs of Talleyrand," (Introduction by the American Minister to France, Whitelaw Reid—A Strange Childhood—Talleyrand and Parisian Society—La Fayette—The American Revolution—The Duke of Orleans—Origin of the Revolution—Talleyrand in England—Talleyrand in America—Talleyrand and Hamilton), by Talleyrand; "Pioneer Spanish Families in California," by Charles Howard Shinn (illustrated); "The Missions of Alta California," by John T. Doyle (illustrated); "A Romance of Morgan's Rough Riders," "The Raid," by Basil W. Duke; "The Capture," by Orlando B. Wilcox; "The Escape," by Thomas H. Hines (illustrated); "Colonel Carter of Cartersville," III. (began in November), by F. Hopkinson Smith (illustrated); "Fireflies," by Charles Henry Liders; "Sister Dolores," II. (began in December), by James Lane Allen; "In Maiden Meditation," by George A. Hibbard; "Chinese Music," by H. E. Krehbiel (with music); "Nannie's Career," by Viola Roseboro; "Heart Longing," by Constantina E. Brooks; "At the Town Farm," by Esther Bernon Carpenter, Californiana; "A Californian Lion and a Pirate," by Maria Antonio Castro; "A Carnival Ball at Monterey in 1829," by Brigidia Briones; "A Spanish Girl's Journey from Monterey to Los Angeles," by Amelia Sibirian; "A Glimpse of Domestic Life in 1827," by Brigidia Briones; "A Letter from General Sutter," by J. A. Sutter; and the departments Topics of the Time, Open Letters, and Bric-à-Brac.